

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 14, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WEBER, from Monday, May 14, to Saturday, May 19, inclusive, on account of important business.

To Mr. DE LANO, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MATSON, until Saturday, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas, to print in the RECORD certain remarks on the bill (H. R. 9600) to declare the duties, enforce the obligations, and regulate the service of railroad companies as carriers of interstate commerce, and for other purposes. [See APPENDIX.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of Merchants' National Bank of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

LOAN OF CERTAIN ARMS AND EQUIPMENTS.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the House Calendar and take up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he shall deem proper, to loan to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts one hundred and fifty rifles and equipments, belts, bayonets, scabbards, and cartridge-boxes, for use at the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that company, to be returned on or before the 1st day of July next.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendment:

In the ninth line, after the word "returned," insert "in good order."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TARIFF DEBATE.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That general debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill (H. R. 9051) entitled "An act to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue," shall close on Saturday, May 19.

Mr. MILLS. If there be no objection, I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MILLS moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

GEORGE W. DAVENPORT.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 882) to correct the muster of and for the relief of George W. Davenport and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the muster of George W. Davenport, late second lieutenant of Company C, Eighth Michigan Cavalry, upon the records and rolls of the War Department, so as to show said Davenport as mustered into the military service as second lieutenant of Company C, Eighth Michigan Cavalry, on December 15, 1862, and honorably mustered out on April 30, 1865; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay said George W. Davenport, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money equal to the pay of a second lieutenant of volunteer cavalry from December 15, 1862, to April 30, 1865, first deducting any sum or sums which said Davenport has received on account of his services in the war of the rebellion during the time mentioned aforesaid.

The committee recommend that the bill be amended as follows:

In line 9 strike out the words "December fifteenth, eighteen hundred and

sixty-two," and insert in lieu thereof the words "January fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-three."

In line 10 strike out the words "April thirtieth" and insert in lieu thereof the words "January sixteenth."

In lines 15 and 16 strike out the words "December fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-two," and insert in lieu thereof the words "January fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-three."

In line 16 strike out the words "April thirtieth" and insert in lieu thereof the words "January sixteenth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendments agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FORD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ANDREW J. NEWGENT.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of Andrew J. Newgent, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to pay Andrew J. Newgent, of Jackson County, Missouri, the sum of \$375, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full payment for two horses taken from said Newgent by the Confederate forces, while he, the said Newgent, was lieutenant-colonel commanding the Second Battalion Missouri State Militia, the said horses being the private property of said Newgent.

There being no objection, the bill was considered and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WARNER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction and reference of bills and joint resolutions. Under this call resolutions and memorials of State and Territorial Legislatures, and also resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of Departments, are in order.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN SPECIAL TAXES.

Mr. LAWLER introduced a bill (H. R. 9950) to repeal certain special taxes on retail dealers in liquors, retail dealers in malt liquors, and dealers in manufactured tobacco; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

Mr. LAWLER also introduced the following resolution; which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas petitions bearing the signatures of more than 2,500,000 citizens of the United States request Congress to pass the bill and provide for the establishment of a postal telegraph system: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and they are hereby, requested to set apart a day, to be a continuing order, for the consideration of House bill No. 3404, reported by the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CHICAGO.

Mr. LAWLER also introduced a bill (H. R. 9951) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cause such changes and improvements to be made in the United States custom-house, post-office, and subtreasury building at Chicago, Ill., and erect such additions thereto as in his judgment may be necessary to provide sufficient accommodations for a post-office in said city; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

ELECTRIC WIRES UNDERGROUND.

Mr. TOWNSHEND (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 9952) to provide for placing the electric wires connecting the several Departments of the Government at Washington, D. C., under ground; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOWNSHEND (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 9953) to provide for placing the wires used by the District of Columbia under ground; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT RENO, NEV.

Mr. WOODBURN introduced a bill (H. R. 9954) for the erection of a public building at Reno, Nev.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS OF AMERICA.

Mr. CUMMINGS (by Mr. Cox) introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 166) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to contract for the purchase of copies of the publication entitled Professional Criminals of America, for use in the United States consular service; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HORNELLVILLE, N. Y.

Mr. DAVENPORT introduced a bill (H. R. 9955) for the erection of a public building at Hornellville, N. Y.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. BROWER introduced a bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of certain soldiers and sailors of the late war; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATION BILL.

Mr. BROWER also submitted a resolution requesting the Committee on Education to report Senate bill 371, being the bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools; which was referred to the Committee on Education.

COAL.

Mr. SMITH, of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H. R. 9957) to provide for the discovery, location, and reservation of coal on the public lands; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

MILWAUKEE, LAKE SHORE AND WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. HUDD introduced a bill (H. R. 9958) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CADETS OF NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. WADE introduced a bill (H. R. 9959) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ST. PAUL'S LUTHERAN CHURCH, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ATKINSON introduced a bill (H. R. 9960) to discharge the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, in the District of Columbia, from the payment of certain taxes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. NEAL introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 167) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States changing the terms of office of the President and Vice-President of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the business which may be called up by the Committee on the District of Columbia. If the day is not claimed by that committee, then the regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Mr. MILLS. I make the usual request that all gentlemen having reports to make be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

There was no objection.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Vincent Bowlin;
- A bill (H. R. 7345) for the relief of Samuel J. Jackson;
- A bill (H. R. 6503) for the relief of Benjamin F. Samuel;
- A bill (H. R. 5941) granting a pension to Nicholas Klock;
- A bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Joseph W. McConnell;
- A bill (H. R. 6371) granting a pension to Jesse M. Stillwell;
- A bill (H. R. 8705) granting a pension to Mary G. Adams, widow of Eelsey G. Adams, deceased;
- A bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Jesse M. Stillwell;
- A bill (H. R. 133) to increase the pension of Samuel Lilly;
- A bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to Ida Richards;
- A bill (H. R. 7483) granting a pension to Barbara Murphy;
- A bill (H. R. 9194) granting a pension to Alice Mullin and her minor children;
- A bill (H. R. 5100) increasing the pension of Eliza J. Houck, widow of Phillip Houck;

- A bill (H. R. 5414) granting a pension to Catharine Falvey;
- A bill (H. R. 4500) granting a pension to Melvin Seward;
- A bill (H. R. 2165) for the relief of Benjamin Burtram;
- A bill (H. R. 5575) granting a pension to James J. Snyder; and
- A bill (H. R. 6505) for the relief of Charlotte Fredrick.

SENATE BILLS REPORTED ADVERSELY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the same committee, reported back adversely bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (S. 1007) granting a pension to John S. Coleman;
- A bill (S. 2447) granting a pension to Mary J. Goslee;
- A bill (S. 2330) granting an increase of pension to William Gallagher;
- A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to John Moore; and
- A bill (S. 2084) to restore to the pension-roll the name of Joseph Lewis.

ARREARS OF PENSIONS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table:

A bill (H. R. 1330) to repeal all acts of limitation as to the beginning of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 1359) to define the time when pensions granted under the invalid-pension laws shall take effect;

A bill (H. R. 1377) to amend an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 1384) granting arrears of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 1393) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the payment of arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1879, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 1412) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress, approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1879;

A bill (H. R. 1457) granting arrears of pension;

A bill (H. R. 1543) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 1453) to grant arrears of pensions in certain cases;

A bill (H. R. 1556) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 1633) to amend section 4718 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 1717) to repeal the proviso of section 2 of the act of March 3, 1879, making appropriations for the payment of arrears of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 1723) to remove the limitations in pension cases;

A bill (H. R. 1824) to extend the provisions of the arrears-of-pension act approved March 3, 1879, to pensioners under special acts of Congress, and to repeal the limitation of arrears act;

A bill (H. R. 3350) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1879;

A bill (H. R. 3429) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;

A bill (H. R. 3431) to amend section 2 of chapter 187, United States Statutes at Large, 1877 to 1879, entitled "An act for the payment of the arrears of pension granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879," and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 5068) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9961) relating to the arrears of pensions; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHANIEL FRANCIS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (9795) granting a pension to Nathaniel Francis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA BRYAN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8704) granting a pension to Julia Bryan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SUSAN SINGLETON.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9130) granting a pension to Susan Singleton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on

the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LYDIA HEINY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9034) granting a pension to Lydia Heiny; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

LOUISA ROGERS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. LAURA HOOPER DENBY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1760) to increase the pension of Mrs. Laura Hooper Denby; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JEPHTHA A. JONES.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1173) increasing the pension of Jephtha A. Jones; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA A. RHOADS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 842) granting a pension to Julia A. Rhoads; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES W. BOWMAN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2449) granting a pension to James W. Bowman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN A. BERTRAM.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1762) granting a pension to Benjamin A. Bertram; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE M'QUADE.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2448) granting a pension to Catharine McQuade; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES WHITE.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2520) granting a pension to James White; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY CURTIN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2653) granting a pension to Mary Curtin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE K. WHITTLESEY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2274) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine K. Whittlesey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE BUSEY.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 333) granting a pension to Catharine Busey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH A. SOUTH.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief of Elizabeth A. South; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL PIERCY.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to Samuel

Piercy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALBERT O. ROBB.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9399) granting a pension to Albert O. Robb; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN TAAFFE.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6220) granting a pension to John Taaffe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. JUDITH DEIG.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9314) granting a pension to Mrs. Judith Deig; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES S. BAKER.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9792) to increase the pension of Charles S. Baker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MILTON MERWIN.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9649) continuing the pension of Milton Merwin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PHEBE A. ROMAINE.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7321) granting a pension to Phebe A. Romaine, widow of Joseph Romaine; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RUSSELL L. DOANE.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2507) granting a pension to Russell L. Doane, of Sanilac County, Michigan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOVINIA A. MARSH.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3761) granting a pension to Lovinia A. Marsh; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HIRAM R. ELLIS.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 881) granting a pension to Hiram R. Ellis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS STRODDER.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8087) for the relief of Thomas Strodder; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHANIEL M. BERRY.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1856) granting a pension to Nathaniel M. Berry; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELLEN J. SNEDAKER.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2313) granting a pension to Ellen J. Snedaker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM C. WALLACE YOUNG.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1575) granting an increase of pension to William C. Wallace Young; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ERNST HEIN.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Hein; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back the bill (H. R. 1482) to provide for the construction of a public building at the city of Alexandria, State of Louisiana; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9962) for the erection of a public building at Alexandria, La.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID A. YEAW.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to David A. Yeaw; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CYNTHIA J. CARLTON.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 154) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Cynthia J. Carlton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

D. G. SCOOTEN.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2435) granting a pension to D. G. Scooten; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTHA V. COLEMAN.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to Martha V. Coleman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELEANOR S. LAWSON.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 175) granting a pension to Eleanor S. Lawson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN D. JONES.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 775) granting an increase of pension to John D. Jones; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. NANCY E. SPENCER.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 783) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy E. Spencer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EDWIN E. CHASE.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2571) granting a pension to Edwin E. Chase; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. EMILINE ANDERSON.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2366) granting a pension to Mrs. Emiline Anderson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELVIRA M. DORMAN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Elvira M. Dorman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZA M. SCANDLIN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2779) granting a pension to Eliza M. Scandlin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House

on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN G. MERRITT.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2739) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALLEN BLETHEN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Allen Blethen; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

H. H. RUSSELL.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2609) granting a pension to H. H. Russell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHAN B. RARICK.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2578) granting a pension to Nathan B. Rarick; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. POST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9059) appropriating \$12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 8573) granting a pension to William Partlow; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

- A bill (H. R. 3578) granting a pension to Philip Curran; and
- A bill (H. R. 7915) granting a pension to Eliza E. Peterson.

I. H. CORN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8930) for the relief of I. H. Corn; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALBERT WATSON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9824) for the relief of Albert Watson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE S. THWING.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2240) for the relief of George S. Thwing; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH J. FOY.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2829) granting a pension to Sarah J. Foy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ROBERT H. STURGESS.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 767) granting a pension to Robert H. Sturgess; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID H. LUTMAN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2206) granting a pension to David H. Lutman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM COLLINSWORTH.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1122) granting an increase of pension to William Collinsworth; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET M. MILLER.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZA J. MAYDEN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1254) granting a pension to Eliza J. Mayden; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SALLIE R. ALEXANDER.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Sallie R. Alexander, widow of Lieut. Col. Thomas L. Alexander, United States Army; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MINOR CHILDREN OF PATRICK FRAWLEY.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to the widow and minor children of Patrick Frawley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LYDIA HAWKINS.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to Lydia Hawkins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN LEARY, DECEASED.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1076) granting a pension to the widow of John Leary, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

AUSTIN P. COX.

Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6067) for the relief of Austin P. Cox; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 6530) for the relief of Manual Mason;

A bill (H. R. 4563) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to refund money wrongfully paid for duties on imports by Daniel Marcy; and

A bill (H. R. 7619) for the relief of John P. Clum.

THOMAS G. MACKIE.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6069) for the relief of Thomas G. Mackie and the heirs at law of William A. Hyde, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM H. TABARRAH.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of William H. Tabarrah; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

R. D. BABCOCK.

Mr. CAREY also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of R. D. Babcock; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

IRREGULARITIES IN COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 164) for the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to inquire into existing irregularities, if any, in the compensation of the officers and employes of the Executive Departments and bureaus of the Government; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GRANT OF CERTAIN LANDS, WYOMING.

Mr. WHEELER also, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. HATCH rose and was recognized.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] may have an extension of his time, not exceeding thirty minutes, if he so desires, in order to conclude the remarks which he is about to make to the committee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] and to the Committee of the Whole for the courtesy extended to me. Nothing less than the magnitude of the interests involved in the pending bill and its effects upon the prosperity and welfare of the people of the whole country would induce me to trespass upon the patience of the House at this time. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I would be faithless to my own convictions, derelict in my duty to the people I have the honor to represent upon this floor, and disloyal to the interests confided to the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, if I refused or neglected to speak earnestly and plainly upon what I consider a legislative crisis in the history of the country. I shall offer no apology to this House, as I have never offered one anywhere, for speaking in behalf of the agriculturists and of the agricultural interests of the country.

Agriculture is the oldest and the most honorable occupation of man. It is the foundation of our earliest civilization, and its development marks the periods of the passage in the history of the world "from savagery to barbarism and from barbarism to civilization." It is to-day the foundation of all commercial and material progress in this country. It marks in every age of the world the steps of civilization as clearly and distinctly as the posts mark the miles on the road. The history of the world teaches us that in all ages, in every country, agriculture has borne more than its fair proportion of the burdens of government.

Whether taxation has been exacted from it in kind, or under whatever system taxes have been levied, agriculture has always borne more than its just proportion, and too often, as in our own country, has been the prey of skillfully devised systems of taxation for the benefit and enrichment of some favored class. This, Mr. Chairman, is particularly true in the nineteenth century and under our republican form of government in the year 1888.

No system of taxation can be devised which benefits one class of the people in a country that does not bear with equal hardship upon some other class or classes. It is utterly impossible to devise a scheme of taxation that will inure to the benefit of one class without imposing a corresponding burden upon other classes. Under our system of taxation the largest proportion of the money exacted from the people by the Federal Government comes through the custom-house. It is either levied upon articles that are not manufactured in this country, in which case the Government gets the sole benefit of the tax, or it is levied upon articles that are manufactured in this country as well as in foreign countries, and in all such cases the Government gets its proportion of the tax, while the manufacturer of the protected articles is also benefited by the tax; and the proposition which has been stated upon the floor of this House by more than one gentleman, that a tax upon an article manufactured abroad and brought into this country through the custom-house does not add to the cost of the article to the consumer is too ridiculous to be met by argument.

A gentleman who can persuade himself to believe that proposition certainly could not be convinced by argument, even if one should rise from the dead. The idea that a tax upon a manufactured article does not add to its cost to the consumer is as ridiculous as the idea that the freight charges added to the cost of an article transported 1,000 or 3,000 miles does not add to its price to the consumer. No tax can be levied upon a manufactured article that does not benefit the manufacturer, and a long line of the ablest writers and speakers upon this question, covering a period of a hundred years, have stated time and again that the manufacturer alone receives the benefit of such taxes. And, Mr. Chairman, within the last few years there has been added to the roll of illustrious authorities who have declared this to be a maxim in political economy the name of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], an extract from whose life of Hamilton was read upon this floor by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] the other day, in which it is stated that the tariff tax inures to the benefit of the manufacturer alone.

Now, sir, if that proposition be true, the agriculturists and the great mass of consumers of this country certainly have no share in the profits made by the manufacturers, and therefore no share in the benefits resulting from this species of taxation.

Mr. Chairman, there has been enough written and said upon this subject within the last week or two in the House of Representatives to deter almost anybody from attempting a set tariff speech at this stage

of the discussion of the pending bill. History has been ransacked, libraries have been overhauled, and everything of interest upon the question that has been printed within the last hundred years has been quoted upon this floor.

I have been looking through the RECORD at some of the printed speeches, and they remind me of one of those new-fangled patch quilts, some of them "crazy-quilts" at that. They are patched all through with quotations and tables, and again quotations, in a manner which must appal the reader (and which certainly does appal the speaker), who is to follow their publication. I do not, therefore, expect, and do not undertake, to say anything new upon this subject; but I do wish to call the attention of the House and, as far as my words can reach, the attention of the country to the proposition I have laid down, that a tax which enriches the manufacturer impoverishes the farmer. We have seen in this discussion a good deal of skill and ability on the part of our friends on the other side in the manner in which they have conducted their part of it, so as to lead not only the minds of the members on this floor, but the minds of the people throughout the country, into a discussion of the principles of taxation, as if we were undertaking here to inaugurate a brand new system of tariff.

I wish it were true. I am ready for that contest whenever it comes. I do not believe in the present system. I do not believe in the principles upon which the present system is based. But what is the bill under discussion and pending before the House to-day? Is it a departure from any principles involved in the Morrill tariff act? Not at all; it preserves, I am sorry to say, every principle and feature of that law. It is simply a proposition of modification and reduction. It does not touch a principle involved in what is known as the Morrill tariff act. I wish we had a bill pending before the House to-day based entirely upon a principle of equality and fairness—better and deeper than we can get in the present measure. But I do not intend to be led off by the adroitness and skill of our friends on the other side into discussing the principles involved in this bill. They are fastened upon us; and all we can hope to do, and all that this bill seeks to do, is simply to reduce under the present system the amount of taxes now collected by the Government and put into the Treasury; that is all.

What is the condition of the Treasury of the United States to-day under the present tariff law? What is the attitude of the Government of the United States contrasted with that of all the other nations of the earth in regard to this subject of taxation? Let us look for a moment.

At a meeting of the National Institute of Statistics, held in Europe, a detailed comparison of the revenues and expenditures of seven of the leading states of Europe was given by M. Cerboni, superintendent of accounts, or perhaps I should rather say auditor-general of the Kingdom of Italy. The total receipts and expenditures for these different nations for the year 1885-86 were as follows:

Austria—	
Receipts	\$380,000,000
Expenses	382,000,000
England—	
Receipts	465,000,000
Expenses	480,000,000
France—	
Receipts	602,000,000
Expenses	583,000,000
Germany—	
Receipts	\$477,000,000
Expenses	478,000,000
Italy—	
Receipts	282,000,000
Expenses	286,000,000
Russia—	
Receipts	613,000,000
Expenses	624,000,000
Spain—	
Receipts	167,000,000
Expenses	175,000,000

With the exception of France, not one of these seven countries I have named levies \$1 of tax upon its people over and above the amount needed for the ordinary and extraordinary expenses of the Government. Not a single European country to-day exacts more tribute from its people than it needs for the expenses of its government; and I say here to-day that there is not a kingdom in Europe that would dare to exact of its people \$100,000,000 a year in excess of the needs of the government. Such an exaction would produce a revolution in any country in Europe. There is not a government upon the face of this earth, except the United States, that is strong enough to lay the heavy and hard hand of the taxing power upon its people in excess of the wants of that government. But under the system which has been fastened upon us, what have we been doing? In 1885-'86, the year referred to in the figures I have read, the gross receipts of our Government were \$336,000,000, in round numbers, and the expenditures \$221,000,000; in 1886-'87 the receipts were \$371,000,000; actual expenses, \$244,000,000; disbursements for all purposes, only \$267,000,000, showing a surplus revenue in 1885-'86 of nearly \$94,000,000, and in 1886-'87 nearly \$104,000,000.

Under the present system the Government of the United States is exacting from the people of this country nearly a hundred million dollars a year more than it needs. For what purpose is this tribute levied? I propose to undertake to show for what purpose it is done. It is done to enrich favored classes that have fastened their fangs upon the legis-

lation of this country. It is done to enrich one class of people at the expense of the masses. The wholesystem was conceived in greed and avarice, and it has been maintained from that day to this by misrepresentation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. PLUMB. Will my friend from Missouri allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HATCH. With great pleasure.

Mr. PLUMB. Are any of the European countries which have been named by the gentleman engaged in paying their public debt?

Mr. HATCH. I answer, yes, sir; some of them are paying their public debt, and some of them are paying interest on their public debt. France is paying part of her public debt. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that the United States Government to-day is not in a position to pay its public debt; and it has been placed in that same position by the same political party that inaugurated the system of legislation that exacts tribute from one portion of the country for the benefit of another.

But over and above all the needs of the Government beyond every dollar that the Government of the United States can use legitimately to-day, except to take the surplus and go into the open market and pay an exorbitant price for these bonds, we are exacting from the people, taking from the arteries of trade and commerce, nearly \$100,000,000 that ought to be left in the pockets of the honest people of the country.

Mr. PLUMB. I would like to ask one more question, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. HATCH. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. Does not section 3693 of the Revised Statutes provide that the interest-bearing debt of the United States may be paid whenever bonds bearing a less rate of interest can be sold at par in coin; and if so, why not pay the public debt?

Well, my friend, I am one member of this House who has stood here for nine years pleading for the payment of this public debt.

Mr. HERBERT. We paid all that we could pay under the law, and now we are buying it.

Mr. HATCH. We paid every dollar that was due and are glad to do it, and if I have received any one instruction more emphatic than another from the people whom I have the honor to represent upon this floor, it is that I should always vote to pay the public debt. I have never seen occasion to vary from that principle. We are willing to be taxed for that purpose; but we are not willing to be robbed day after day and year after year to put money into the coffers of bloated monopolies and favored manufacturers of the country. That is the position the agricultural community of this country assumes to-day; and right here the gentleman's question reminds me of what I had intended to refer to later on, but shall take occasion to call attention to now.

If gentlemen on that side would read history, if their memories were not so treacherous, if they would learn the lesson which experience would teach from what transpired on this floor in the Forty-sixth Congress, they would accept with avidity and gladness the bill tendered to them by the Democratic party to-day.

My friend from New York sitting near me [Mr. Cox] remembers it, all gentlemen around me remember it, when in the Forty-sixth Congress Mr. Fernando Wood, of New York, then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported to the House what was known as the Wood refunding bill, where he offered to the national banks, through the measure then presented, a bond, I believe, if my memory does not deceive me, of 3 per cent., and when what was known as the Carlisle amendment was put on the bill and passed the House and Senate; but the national banks, in the exercise of their arrogant power, induced the President of the United States to veto that bill; and yet within less than twelve months afterwards they would have given \$10,000,000 to have had it passed.

Never from that day to this has there been a time when as liberal a bill in their interest could be passed through the House of Representatives; and if gentlemen on the other side would learn a lesson from the experience of the past they would not only take this bill now before them, but they would take it by a unanimous vote upon that side and be glad to get it; for I tell you, gentlemen, if it is rejected now, within less than twelve months you will be willing to give millions of dollars to get as moderate a reduction of taxation as we now propose. In my judgment, if this bill is not passed by this Congress the voice of the people sweeping over the length and breadth of the land will place a membership in the Fifty-first Congress that will take this system, and, instead of simply reducing it as we propose to do, will bring it down to a point where it will do equal and exact justice to all the interests of the country without regard to favored classes or sections.

We have had some very remarkable statements made during the course of this debate. I think one of the most eloquent, easily and gracefully delivered speeches that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to was delivered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURNOWS]; and one of the most laudatory of his own section that was ever delivered was delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I propose to notice a few of the statements made by these gentlemen. The figures that I propose to embody in my remarks have been verified by the statistician of the Agricultural Department, and I believe they are exact and absolutely correct.

Now, it has been stated, and no man denies it, that since 1850 this country has grown in wealth and in prosperity at a ratio unprecedented in the history of any nation on earth. Notwithstanding the four years of the civil war, notwithstanding the destruction of property during that period—from 1850 to 1880—the country had grown to an extent almost startling when we contemplate it. It has grown up into the billions. I know it to be true; the figures state it. Gentlemen upon the other side as well as upon this side have quoted them, and I believe them to be correct. But where has that money been concentrated? What favored class, if any, in the United States have reaped the benefit of that great accumulation of wealth? Has it been equally and evenly distributed throughout the land? No. Has it, in any single State or section of the country, been distributed to all classes alike? No. Has one class solely got the benefit of it? Yes. Now, look first at the general figures before I come down to itemizing some of them.

The nearest estimate that can be made of the value of the agricultural wealth of this country is based upon the valuation of farms, farm animals, farm implements, and machinery. The ownership of the land, its improvements, the ownership of all the stock upon the farm, the ownership of all the tools and machinery necessary to run it, constitute the farmer's capital. In 1850 the farmers of this country owned \$3,967,343,580 of property. In 1860—mark this—they had increased their aggregate wealth from the sum named to nearly eight billions, or, to be more exact, \$7,980,493,063, a little more than doubling the original capital in ten years, and showing by calculation a net increase of about 101 per cent. In 1870 they had increased from \$7,980,493,063 to \$11,124,958,747; not quite 40 per cent. In 1880 they increased from \$11,124,958,747 to \$12,104,001,538, or only about 9 per cent. Between 1850 and 1860 we had the lowest tariff and the lowest rate of tax collections that we have had in this country for the past seventy years. Between 1870 and 1880 we have had the highest we have ever had. Between 1850 and 1860 the farmers of the country more than doubled their wealth, and between 1870 and 1880 they accumulated but 9 per cent. increase.

I append an exact and verified table of the figures.

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
Farms.....	\$3,271,575,426	\$6,645,045,007	\$9,262,803,861	\$10,197,096,776
Farm animals.....	544,180,516	1,089,829,915	1,525,276,457	1,500,384,707
Farm implements...	151,587,638	246,118,141	336,878,429	406,520,055
Total.....	3,967,343,580	7,980,493,063	11,124,958,747	12,104,001,538

While I do not claim that the high tariff since 1861 is the sole cause of this decay in the industry of more than half our people, I do most earnestly contend that in that fact is to be found the secret of one of the most potential causes of the terrible blight and depreciation of values which has befallen American agriculture.

If this is not true, why is it that during the same decades, and fostered and protected by this system, the manufacturing districts have so enormously increased in wealth? There is but one answer. Protection benefits the manufacturer alone, while it oppresses and levies tribute upon all other classes.

Now, contrast the statements made and the figures given with the following table of the wealth per capita of the nine manufacturing States with that of all the other States, from 1850 to 1880 inclusive:

Wealth per capita according to census estimate of true valuation.

Years.	For the nine manufacturing States, Maine to Pennsylvania, inclusive.			All other States.		
	True value of real and personal estate.	Population.	Per capita.	True value of real and personal estate.	Population.	Per capita.
1850.....	\$3,130,989,851	8,626,851	\$363	\$4,004,790,377	14,565,025	\$275
1860.....	5,591,607,424	10,594,268	528	10,598,008,644	20,849,053	507
1870.....	15,290,032,687	12,298,730	1,243	14,778,485,820	26,259,641	563
1880.....	19,630,000,000	14,507,407	1,353	24,012,000,000	35,648,376	674

This shows that the wealth per head was nearly as much in other States as in the Eastern and Middle States in 1850 and 1860, while in 1880 it was twice as much per capita in the nine manufacturing States named.

The population of that region had increased 68 per cent., and wealth 527 per cent. The population of the other States had increased 145 per cent., and their wealth 500 per cent.; i. e., the increase of wealth in the manufacturing States is greater with an increment of 68 per cent. of population than in the other States, which show an increase of 145 per cent. in population.

But the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALINGEE], who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat this morning—I do not know that I could make any impression upon him, but I would like him to hear what I have to say—the gentleman from New Hampshire, with a pride

that was very commendable and an eloquence that is not excelled by that of any gentleman on this floor, gave us a graphic picture of the six New England States, how much they had gained in wealth, and he claimed that this prosperity was due to the present tariff laws, and I agree with him, as it is a complete vindication of my own position. Now let us see what proportion and what classes of the people of the six New England States have accumulated this property, and with what consummate tact and skill these gentlemen attempt to withhold from their constituents at home and from this House the real facts.

Oh! they fight the West as an agricultural producing region and not a manufacturing one; and they say we are sectional if we undertake to reform the tariff because it is in the interest of the West. I want to find out whether the agriculturists of the six New England States between 1870 and 1880 received their equal, fair, and just proportion of this immense accretion of wealth. In 1850, in the six New England States, the total value of the farms, farm animals, implements, etc., the wealth of the agriculturists of the six New England States, aggregated the amounts shown in the following table:

Total values of farms, farm animals, implements, etc., of the six New England States.

States.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
New Hampshire.....	\$66,432,023	\$83,297,400	\$99,295,801	\$88,715,693
Maine.....	65,852,031	97,424,385	131,128,193	123,805,039
Vermont.....	78,749,737	114,196,989	168,566,189	130,811,490
Massachusetts.....	121,933,641	139,888,690	138,432,891	164,288,956
Rhode Island.....	19,100,640	22,179,388	25,496,246	29,039,046
Connecticut.....	82,086,453	104,430,565	145,063,019	135,185,834
Total.....	435,154,525	661,467,417	707,942,439	671,846,058

In 1880, after more than ten years of profound peace and unexampled prosperity, ten years of the largest accumulations of wealth that New England has never seen, the wealth of her agriculturists fell off from \$707,000,000 to \$671,000,000, a loss of over \$36,000,000; while the same figures demonstrate the fact that the largest relative or percentage gain in agricultural wealth was during the low-tariff period between 1850 and 1860.

This system, merciless as death itself, robs alike the neighbor and the stranger; robs a portion of their own people as it does the people of the Mississippi Valley. The agriculturists and people to-day are poorer, relatively, than they were in 1870; and the census of 1890 will show that the decrease has been greater since 1880 than in the decade that I have named.

Mr. HERBERT. Illustrating the value of the home market they talked so much about.

Mr. HATCH. I will come to that presently. I want the two gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT and Mr. RUSSELL], whom I see before me, who are representatives of this agricultural interest in New England, and my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. MCKINNEY], during this coming campaign to hold up to the farmers of New England this fact, that while New England has grown rich the farmers of New England have grown poor. In spite of their home market, in spite of the advantages of large cities and manufacturing towns and all the blessings that flow from this high protective tariff, as stated by our friends upon the other side, the agriculturists of New England are poorer than they were ten years ago.

Some gentleman upon the other side has spoken of the three great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, the other three manufacturing States. From what has been said you would suppose that the agriculturists had grown very rich. What do the figures show in regard to those States—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania?

Value of farms, farm animals, farm implements, and machinery.

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
New York.....	\$650,202,057	\$936,366,584	\$1,494,738,190	\$1,216,637,765
New Jersey.....	135,342,305	202,131,598	286,834,830	212,678,330
Pennsylvania.....	464,098,693	754,166,275	1,194,786,853	1,085,405,324
Total.....	1,249,643,055	1,892,664,457	2,976,379,873	2,524,721,419

A loss of over four hundred and fifty millions in the last-named decade.

Mr. BLAND. Of farm values?

Mr. HATCH. This statement includes farm values, improvements, stock, and farming implements. They include the entire capital and wealth of the farmers of those States. And Pennsylvania, the most favored of all the States under the present system, with her myriad of highly protected industries, her unexampled accumulation of wealth in the hands of favored classes, her long role of millionaires laid the iron hand of protection upon her farmers, and in the name of "American industries" robbed the agriculturists of \$99,381,529 in the decade between 1870 and 1880, and it is still going on in an increased ratio.

What a picture the little State of New Hampshire cuts in this table, the State that was so extolled by my friend [Mr. GALLINGER]. He held it up in contrast with Southern States and showed how much more money they were making than could possibly be made in the agricultural States of the South. How, then, stands New Hampshire in this race? In 1850 the agriculturists of that State had a value of \$66,432,023; in 1860, \$83,297,400; in 1870, \$99,295,801. In 1880 they had lost nearly eleven millions of dollars, having only \$88,715,693.

Now if this system of protective tariff piles up this immense amount of money, which has been stated, in the New England and other manufacturing States, I ask again, who gets it? As stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts in his history of Alexander Hamilton, the manufacturer alone gets it. But they say to us in the West, if you will simply build up manufactories and diversify your industries you will grow rich as we do. But, my friends, we do not want to grow rich as you do. Public sentiment in the West is upon a higher plane than robbing one portion of its own people to enrich another portion. [Applause.] Whenever you devise a system of taxation that will bear equally upon all the people of the West then we want to support it. But when you present to us a proposition that we shall rob nine men out of ten in the Mississippi Valley simply to make one man rich we reject it with scorn and contempt. And that is what you are doing.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHEADLE. I understood you to say, in stating the evidence of wealth of the farming class, that it consisted in their lands and stock. Do you take into consideration the money they have on deposit at interest?

Mr. HATCH. Well, my friend, between 1850 and 1860 the farmers had some surplus money at interest; but since your party has been robbing them under the existing tariff system they have not any surplus money left. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman now permit me to state just one fact?

Mr. HATCH. I can not yield for the gentleman to make a speech. If he wants to ask a question—

Mr. CHEADLE. As a representative of an agricultural district, I want to make just one statement of fact—

Mr. HATCH. Let the gentleman get his own time. I can not yield for a statement.

Mr. CHEADLE. I only desire to say—

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield to the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. CHEADLE, while Mr. HATCH was proceeding with his remarks, endeavored to make himself heard.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes, I will stir you up worse than that before I get through. You gentlemen who are here representing agricultural districts in the West and are opposing this bill will find a storm of indignation when you go home that will be as much as you can meet. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know whereof I speak.

Mr. KERR. I desire to ask the gentleman—

Mr. HATCH. The misfortune of the gentlemen over there is that whenever any one on this side of the House undertakes to make a point on this tariff bill they try to break the force of it; not with argument, but by undertaking to ask questions. They are living, breathing interrogation points. [Laughter.] There are some gentlemen over there who never take the pains to expend time and labor in the preparation of a speech of their own, but are always trying to get their names into somebody else's speech. They remind me very much of what I heard a distinguished Presbyterian divine of Kentucky say once when he referred to the fact that the greatest of English poets had stated that some men are born great, others achieve greatness, and others have greatness thrust upon them. If the poet had lived in this day and generation and been acquainted with the House of Representatives he would have added a fourth class—the class of men who are continually thrusting themselves upon greatness. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Only a question.

Mr. HATCH. I will yield to the gentleman for a question, if he will not make a speech.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I wish to ask whether it is entirely becoming for the gentleman from Missouri to make that charge against this side of the House, in view of the fact that we have extended his time half an hour, although there are many gentlemen here still desirous to speak?

Mr. HATCH. That has nothing in the world to do with the question I have stated, for I have patiently sat in my seat during this entire debate and have never interrupted a gentleman on either side by a question. I am not in the habit of doing so. When a gentleman has anything to say on this floor let him say it in his own time; and if I want to reply I will take my own time to do it, and not try to force myself into his speech. I was under the impression that the extension of time was given to me and not to gentlemen who seek to consume it with questions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE] asked me whether I included in my statement the money owned by the farmers. So far as was possible to get at that matter in taking the census of what the farmers own their money is included. This is a

statement of the agricultural wealth of the country. But I want to state here, without the fear of successful contradiction, that the bank deposits by farmers in the agricultural districts of the country have been steadily going down, growing "beautifully less" under this tariff, ever since 1860. I know a bank in my own county to-day which was in existence between 1850 and 1860; and you know it (addressing Mr. BIGGS, who sat near Mr. HATCH); you borrowed many a dollar from it with which to handle stock—I refer to the old Branch Bank of the State of Missouri, at Palmyra. It still exists under a different name. Between 1850 and 1860, in Paris and Palmyra, the county seats of Monroe and Marion Counties, and other large agricultural counties, 75 per cent. of the stock of the local banks and of all the money deposited therein belonged to the farmers. Is not that true?

Mr. BIGGS. It is; I know it to have been the fact.

Mr. HATCH. And to-day 75 per cent. of the loans of those banks are made to the farmers. That is the way the tables have turned. I challenge the statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] when he says that one-third of the deposits in the savings-banks of New England are made by farmers. I deny that statement; and I challenge him at any time during this discussion to produce any statistics to show that any such proportion of the farmers of New England are depositors in the savings-banks. I know that the farmers are getting poorer every year. I know it by personal experience; I know it by personal intercourse with leading farmers in the West; I know it by statistics which no man can gainsay. And it is perfectly natural that it should be so. The burden of this tariff taxation falls upon them; they pay the heaviest proportion of it. Everything that they buy is taxed, and everything that they sell is free.

I see the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] in his seat. I want to refer to a very singular statement made by him and a table printed in his speech. On page 3895 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that gentleman, with a facetiousness that has never been equaled on this floor except by one or two other distinguished gentlemen, undertook to ridicule the idea that the farmers are not protected under our existing tariff legislation; and he gave a list of the imports of farm products—

Mr. GUENTHER. Do you propose to protect the farmers?

Mr. HATCH. Do I propose to protect them? Well, if you will just listen a few minutes, you will hear my answer to that question; I will show you how I propose to protect them. I propose to protect them simply by keeping them from being robbed, that is all. I want to protect them against robbery, but not against fair competition in the open markets of the world.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin prints a list of farm products imported into the country, and under the head of breadstuffs he has placed barley; and then in a note—

Mr. GUENTHER rose.

Mr. HATCH. Let me get through my statement. You will be more uneasy before I am done with you. According to the gentleman's statement nearly \$6,000,000 worth of breadstuffs were imported in three months, and over \$4,000,000 worth consisted of barley. Barley is brought from Canada to Milwaukee and Rochester and Detroit, and made into beer, every bushel of it made into beer. I ask, then, is barley a breadstuff? Does the gentleman claim that barley is a necessary of life?

Mr. GUENTHER. It is to some persons. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to show the skill with which these gentlemen try to mislead the people. They talk about the imported "breadstuffs," when four millions out of the six millions are barley for beer! And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] makes a great speech about that.

Mr. ATKINSON. Is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] aware of the fact that in the report on Commerce and Navigation barley is classified as breadstuffs?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes, I know it is; and the man down there that classified it in that way knows as little about it as my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] or the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GUENTHER. We know as much in Wisconsin about agriculture as they know in Missouri.

Mr. HATCH. Then the gentleman says wheat is protected. Wheat protected! Oh, yes. They say, "We protect the farmer by putting a tariff of 20 cents per bushel on wheat." What farmer in Wisconsin is so ignorant that you can palm that off on him? What farmer lives to-day in the Mississippi Valley, who grows a bushel of wheat, that you can palm off on him the proposition that he is protected by a duty on wheat? Gentlemen talk about wheat coming over the Canadian line; and that duty was laid upon wheat to protect a few farmers upon the Canadian border.

Mr. GUENTHER. Will the gentleman permit me—

Mr. HATCH. I can not yield further.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then the gentleman should not assail me.

Mr. HATCH. I do not propose to assail the gentleman. I assail his argument. The gentleman has had his time, and I did not interrupt him.

Mr. GUENTHER. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; ask me a question, if you want to.

Mr. GUENTHER. Do you know the difference between the price of wheat in Canada and the price of wheat in Wisconsin?

Mr. HATCH. I do, and I am going to tell you. I will give you all that information. Just hold still for a minute or two. I know it hurts. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no, it does not hurt me.

Mr. HATCH. Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1887 the United States produced 456,000,000 bushels of wheat, that is, we were the largest wheat-producing country in the world. In the same year Canada produced 36,000,000 bushels. And yet we, producing 456,000,000 bushels, are afraid of Canada with her little 36,000,000 bushels! If you take out of the Canadian product one-ninth, or 4,000,000 bushels, for seed, that leaves Canada only 32,000,000 bushels to feed her own people and for export. And yet gentlemen tell the farmers of the United States that they are protected because we levy a duty of 20 cents a bushel on wheat! Gentlemen, you do not deceive anybody by that proposition. There was a time when wheat was exported from the United States to Canada. I heard the Hon. Frank Hurd, at Trenton, N. J., on the 27th of January, 1887, make the statement I am about to read, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT] heard it, too, and it has been published. Mr. Hurd said:

I remember the time when this country shipped millions of bushels of grain annually to Canada. A number of firms in our city of Toledo, Ohio, grew rich out of the trade with Canada under the reciprocity treaty. Now Canada has a specific duty of 25 cents a bushel on your wheat, avowedly for the purpose of retaliation.

Oh, yes, Canada has put a duty of 25 cents a bushel on American wheat, and the American farmer, when he wants a few bushels of Canadian wheat or barley to improve the quality of his grain or to get a new variety, has to pay a tariff of 10 or 20 cents a bushel on it.

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, I have waited very patiently for the gentleman's answer to my question about the difference between the price of wheat in Canada and the price of wheat in Wisconsin, or Minnesota, or Michigan.

Mr. HATCH. I have got that table here, and when I come across it I will give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. GUENTHER. I thought you knew it. I thought you knew everything about agriculture.

Mr. HATCH. How much is it? Can the gentleman state it himself?

Mr. GUENTHER. You state it. This is not my speech.

Mr. HATCH. No; but if this was his speech the gentleman would cut a much better figure when he goes back to Wisconsin in the next campaign. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the gentleman whether he has not taken up enough of my time. I am afraid he is in the condition of the infant he described here the other day, and that he is crying for peppermint. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no; my stomach is in excellent condition. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Now, gentlemen talk about the price of wheat, and we have heard a great deal on that subject. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] gave an illustration the other day that ought to be an answer to every gentleman upon the other side on this question of the price of wheat. The value of wheat is fixed in the markets of the world. The value of every bushel of wheat or grain in Canada, in Kansas, in New York, in Massachusetts, or in any State, is fixed by the markets of the world, plus the cost of the transportation that is necessary to take it to the center of trade. The price of wheat in Canada is controlled by its quality or grade and the locality at which it is offered for sale, just as it is in this country.

Mr. MORGAN. And the center of trade is where the surplus goes.

Mr. HATCH. There is where the surplus goes.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], in the very eloquent and classical speech that he made a few days ago, stated that only about 10 per cent. of the products of the farmers of this country were exported. Yes; we do not export much of the peas and strawberries and "goober" peas, and all that; but why is not the gentleman candid and frank enough in his statement to say to the House and to the country what proportion of the great cereal crops are exported? Mr. Chairman, three-tenths of all the wheat grown in this country is exported. Between 1876 and 1880 one-third of the entire crop was exported. A little over one-half of the tobacco crop is exported; and about seven-tenths of the entire cotton crop. Of all meat products, from 8 per cent. to 10 per cent.; and of pork products alone 15 per cent. is the average for the last twenty-five years, and within that time it has reached a total export of 25 per cent. We have exported in one year the product of seven millions of bogs.

There are a good many things in that table that never were raised for export; they are strictly for home consumption, and a very large proportion are for consumption in the immediate family that raises them. A very small proportion of perishable vegetables and fruits go abroad.

But the point that I want to emphasize right here is this: That the farmers of Missouri and the Mississippi Valley have the price of their great products fixed by what that surplus brings in the markets of the world. Liverpool fixes the price of wheat for the world; and it amuses me to find gentlemen upon the other side, almost with tears in their

eyes, pleading for protection from pauper labor of Europe in behalf of their rich manufacturers. Have you ever heard one of them say a word about the pauper labor of Europe as it affects the agricultural classes of this country?

Mr. BIGGS. Not one.

Mr. HATCH. Not one, says my friend from California. I know it; not one. Not one word is uttered or one thought given in behalf of the great masses of our people who are the bulk of the laborers of this country, the agricultural masses of our community. And what sort of competition do they have to meet?

Mr. Chairman, here is a table embodied in a crop report, No. 46, of the Department of Agriculture, and on page 590 I find a tabulated list of the wages of agricultural laborers in some of the countries producing wheat. Listen to it. India, that produced in 1887, 239,000,000 bushels of wheat to throw upon the markets of the world, in 1886 paid for wages (reduced to dollars and cents in our currency) \$2.38 a month, and in 1884 it was just \$2 a month.

The wages of agricultural labor were equivalent to \$2.28 per month in 1876, \$2.01 in 1884, and if the same nominal rate in 1887, the reduction in value of the rupee would make \$1.81, or nearly 7 cents per day for twenty-six working days. The rupee is rated at 43.6 cents in 1876, 38.6 in 1884, and 34.6 in 1887.

The following statement shows the interior average prices of wheat, and also the wages of agricultural labor.

Provinces.	Wheat, per bushel.		Wages, per month.			
	1876.	1884.	1876.		1884.	
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>R. A.*</i>	<i>£. S.</i>	<i>R. A.*</i>	<i>£. S.</i>
Northwestern Provinces.....	51	56	4 3	\$1.83	3 13	\$1.46
Oude.....	47	53	3 5	1.44	2 15	1.13
Punjab.....	50	45	5 14	2.56	6 2	2.35
Central Provinces.....	37	41	4 5	1.88	4 5	1.65
Bombay.....	88	76	8 4	3.60	8 13	3.35
Bengal.....	66	68	6 8	2.83	6 0	2.30
Assam.....	88	88				
British Burmah.....	68	123				
Mysore.....	143	108	7 0	3.05	7 0	2.68
Madras.....	110	92				
Central India.....	94	59	5 0	2.18	4 12	1.82
Rajputana.....	84	63	3 13	1.66	4 0	1.53
Hyderabad.....	67	63	7 0	3.05	6 12	2.59
Average.....	58	53.7	£5.23	2.28	5 22	2.00

* In rupees and annas; 16 annas to the rupee. † Rupees and decimals.

Think of it for a moment: 7 cents a day the laborer in the wheat fields of India gets; and our friends who are in favor of this system of building up the industries of the country, of piling up the money in the pockets and coffers of the manufacturers, never look beyond that manufacturing interest or have a word to say when they are confronted with the proposition that the American wheat-grower comes into competition with foreign labor that can live on \$2.38 a month or as low as 7 cents a day. It is all right for the farmers to compete with the cheap and most degraded labor of the world, but it is terrible if the American artisan and machinist and mechanic have to come into competition with the skilled and cheaper labor of Europe.

I here append a table showing the wheat supply of the world for the years 1880 to 1887, inclusive, that those interested may examine carefully the condition and price of the labor with which the American wheat-grower must compete in raising this most valuable and important cereal.

Wheat of the world.

Countries.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Europe.....	1,128,000,000	1,160,000,000	1,283,000,000	1,553,000,000
United States.....	499,000,000	383,000,000	504,000,000	421,000,000
Canada.....	30,000,000	32,000,000	47,000,000	30,000,000
Mexico.....	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
South America.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
India.....	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Australasia.....	36,000,000	32,000,000	30,000,000	32,000,000
Africa and Western Asia.....	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
Total.....	2,111,000,000	2,025,000,000	2,282,000,000	2,054,000,000

Countries.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Europe.....	1,270,000,000	1,183,000,000	1,108,000,000	1,245,000,000
United States.....	513,000,000	387,000,000	457,000,000	456,000,000
Canada.....	45,000,000	47,000,000	38,000,000	36,000,000
Mexico.....	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
South America.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	29,000,000	34,000,000
India.....	251,000,000	299,000,000	258,000,000	239,000,000
Australasia.....	46,000,000	37,000,000	22,000,000	35,000,000
Africa and Western Asia.....	130,000,000	134,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
Total.....	2,293,000,000	2,095,000,000	2,055,000,000	2,188,000,000

But to continue the line of thought I was pursuing. I am sorry the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] is not in his seat. I think the climax of absurdity was reached in that gentleman's remarks when he said of the woolen industries of the United States—and I want to quote his exact words as I find them on page 11 of the printed speech. He says:

The great wool-growing interest of the country, a matter of prime interest to all civilized people, only in the infancy of its development.

The wool industry of the United States only in the infancy of its development! We have heard a good deal of "infant industries," but this is carrying it further than I thought a gentleman would have the temerity to do on this floor. I want to put into my speech in the RECORD, so that the gentleman will read it and learn the facts, a reference to some of the early lessons of his childhood that he will find taken from the Bible. As far back as the fourth chapter of Genesis we find, in the second verse:

And Abel was a keeper of sheep.

And when he has digested that and familiarized himself with the flocks of Abel, I want him to turn to the twenty-first chapter of Genesis and read the verses, 21 to 31, inclusive, where Abraham presented Abimelech with sheep and oxen.

And Abraham set seven ewe lambs of the flock by themselves.

That they might be a witness and a commemoration of his having digged the well in dispute.

Wherefore he called that place Beersheba.

And if he is not satisfied with that, let him turn to the thirty-second chapter of Genesis and read there verses 9 to 20, inclusive, where Jacob makes the peace-offering to Esau, including two hundred ewes and twenty rams; a larger flock perhaps than any farmer owns in the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan.

Wool-growing an infant industry! The oldest in the history of man, coming down to us consecrated by ages, marking the very footsteps of civilization and the pathway of progress. Shepherds throughout the world have been caring for their flocks since the oldest history of man; and yet the gentleman talks about it and about wool-growing as an "infant industry!"

I have not time to go into all that I had intended to say upon this wool question; but as a representative of the Western farmer, a wool-grower myself to about the same extent as probably an average of ninety-nine farmers out of one hundred in the Mississippi Valley, I declare that the farmers of the Mississippi Valley to-day, almost unanimously, are in favor of free wool and a corresponding reduction upon the manufactured woolen goods of the country. Give us a reduction of manufactured woolen goods; give us the open markets of the world in which to sell our products, and the American farmer will undertake, wherever it can be profitably done, to grow wool in competition with any other country in the world. Except upon the plains of the Territories and States of the far West the growing of wool as a matter of profit is not an industry; it is simply an incident upon the farms.

The farmers in the Mississippi Valley keep small flocks of sheep for their value in the market as mutton, and the wool crop is simply an incident to that industry.

In support of these positions I will append two articles from the Chicago Tribune of recent date, carefully prepared, ably written, and strengthened by unquestioned facts and figures:

UTTER FAILURE OF THE HIGH WOOL TARIFF.

The chief reduction effected by the Mills bill is in putting wool on the free-list. No other single item of the bill, save that on sugar, would lead to a reduction of over \$2,000,000 of revenue, while the free-listing of wool will of itself cut down the surplus revenues over \$12,000,000 and lead to the cheapening of clothing more than one hundred millions a year. Free wool, therefore, must be considered the distinctive feature of the bill, and the ultra protectionists who have made this provision of the measure their strongest attack should be encouraged to continue the fight on the ground of their own choosing.

No tariff is more unjustifiable than that on raw wool, and the pretense that the levy operates to protect and benefit farmers is already disproved by incontrovertible facts. Eagerly seeking to make a handle of the wool tariff, because this tax was imposed ostensibly for the protection of farmers, the bounty-monopoly advocates now find they have caught a Tartar, but they should not be permitted to shift the argument and abandon the ground of their own selection. Free wool is the chief provision in any genuine tariff-reform bill, and on that main issue the contest must turn.

As the Tribune has repeatedly shown from the official record, the number of sheep in the States of Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota decreased during the period of high wool duties between 1867 and 1882 from 29,879,222 to 14,761,150, or a loss of one-half—a frightful decline of a product in so short a time, and so highly protected. Wool-growing was better maintained during the period of high protection in Pennsylvania and Ohio than in any other States east of the Missouri, but even in these exceptional States the loss was heavy. The Pittsburgh Post has prepared the following table on wool-growing in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, the figures being taken from the census of 1860, the agricultural report of 1887, and the Treasury report on wool prices:

1860—NO TARIFF.

Sheep in Pennsylvania.....	1,631,540
Sheep in Ohio.....	3,546,767
Sheep in New York.....	2,617,855
Prices—fine.....	56 to 60 cents
Prices—medium.....	45 to 50 cents
Prices—coarse.....	40 to 42 cents

1887—HIGH TARIFF.

Sheep in Pennsylvania.....	1,094,323
Sheep in Ohio.....	4,562,913
Sheep in New York.....	1,579,896
Prices—fine.....	33 to 34 cents
Prices—medium.....	37 to 38 cents
Prices—coarse.....	33 to 35 cents

SOME OF THE RESULTS.

Decrease of sheep in three States after twenty years' high protection.....	559,000
Decrease in prices—fine wool.....	23 to 25 cents
Decrease in prices—medium wool.....	8 to 12 cents
Decrease in prices—coarse wool.....	7 cents

If such results as these had followed a reduction of duties or the placing of an article on the free-list the lamentations of the high-tariff monopolies would continue without ceasing; but they must now face the fact that the wool tariff failed to secure even for sheep-growing farmers the results promised, and that even in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio wool-growing declined disastrously under high protection. What was promised at the time this tariff was adopted? Mr. Stephen Colwell, the most active and influential person in devising the wool tariff of 1867, said:

"Give us the needful protection and we will engage that sheep husbandry will increase and be remunerative, while woolen manufactures will expand and diversify, affording a market for the raw material and rescuing the people from their dependence on foreign lands for their clothing, which they will be able to procure permanently at home at less cost than abroad."

How completely each of these promises has been falsified! Instead of sheep husbandry being extended and made remunerative it has dwindled away and fallen off fully 50 per cent. in the States east of the Missouri, and but for the value of sheep as mutton none of the animals could now be raised at a profit in this portion of the country. Instead of woolen manufacturing being expanded and diversified factories can be found all through the manufacturing sections of the East that have been standing idle for years or working only on half time, and, as a leading woolen manufacturer recently said, an advertiser who would offer to buy a woolen-mill at 50 per cent. of its cost would have "more answers than if he wanted a bull pup."

Instead of having a home supply of wool, nearly one-half the wool used in the United States is imported, notwithstanding a 41 per cent. duty, and the raw wool and that embodied in woolen goods brought into this country from abroad with duties added on both, cost the people at least \$60,000,000 per annum. The tremendous burden of a high tax and incident bounties on an article of prime necessity used by every man, woman, and child has been endured for twenty years without producing any of the benefits promised to the farmer, the wool manufacturer, or the wearer of woolen goods.

Mr. Colwell said at the time the high wool tariff was adopted, "The protectionists only asked that their policy should receive a fair trial," and pointed "to the other industries wherein their promises were fulfilled." The trial was granted, and after twenty years the experiment has proved a wretched failure to the growers of sheep and an onerous burden to the people. All persons concerned in wool-growing, as farmers, manufacturers, or consumers, have suffered great injury, and benefit has accrued to no one except a handful of wealthy ranchmen who have great flocks of sheep on the Government and cheap lands of the far Southwest herded by shepherd dogs and the underfed Mexican grazers on nominal pay. And it is the underselling of these ranchmen that has broken down the wool market and almost ruined the sheep-growing business east of the Missouri.

As the flocks of sheep steadily decrease under the coddling of a high tariff of 41 cent. protection in all the States east of Western Kansas and Nebraska, west and south of the ninety-seventh parallel of longitude, in the ranch country, the number of sheep increases. It is the competition of this great area, where sheep can be raised for almost nothing, that is killing our wool-growing in all the old Western, Central, and Eastern States. The following table exhibits the average size of flocks in 1880 and the per cent. of increase to 1885 in the competing sections:

States.	Owners.	Average flock.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Nebraska.....	2,119	157	135
Kansas.....	3,804	216	30
Utah.....	2,001	282	8
Washington.....	1,067	428	18
Oregon.....	4,605	560	90
California.....	4,326	1,430	11
Idaho.....	128	1,465	14
Colorado.....	406	3,075	67
Montana.....	137	3,400	77
Nevada.....	97	4,000	68
New Mexico.....	814	5,450	13
Texas.....	8,390	9,480	118
Wyoming.....	44	13,600	33
Arizona.....	35	23,220	74

The increase here has been, from 1880 to 1884, from 17,710,351 to 25,319,877. Nothing has checked it.

The high wool tariff enables these States and Territories to undersell and seize the American market for wool; and yet scores of Congressmen whose constituents are going out of the wool-growing business refuse to vote to give their people cheaper clothes by placing wool on the free-list. Who are they representing, any way? Certainly not the people living east of the Missouri River.

These gentlemen from the East, who talk so glibly about a home market for the products raised upon the farm and what a value it is to the farmer if he has got a market at his door, do not understand the condition of things in the Mississippi Valley, where farming is upon a broader scale than raising products from little truck patches. There the farmer is dependent not alone upon his home market, but upon agriculturists in other sections of the country and the markets of the world. Where does the farmer of Missouri go for a market for the surplus mules and horses that he raises? To the South. He goes to the cotton-planters and sugar-planters and rice-planters of the South. The very best market that the Western farmer has to-day for the surplus of

the grain upon his farm he finds when he goes to the Southern planter. He goes to him to sell his stock and his bacon. The farmers of the West are as much interested in the price of cotton as the cotton-planter himself. If cotton is depressed, if there is a short crop at the South, there is a low market for the mules and the horses and the surplus produce of the farms of the West. All this boastful talk about the home market for the farmer has been so often exploded that I will not take up the time of the House to go into it further, except simply to affirm that, with the facilities of transportation we have to-day, the farmer of New England has got to sell all but the perishable products he raises in competition with the other sections of the country.

I say the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT], who is said to be the owner and proprietor of the model dairy farm of New England, to-day can not sell the surplus butter produced in that dairy in Boston except at a price fixed by the creameries of Iowa and Northern Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. I know it to be true. Transportation and facilities of exchange have obliterated distances in this country; and except for the little truck which perishes in a day and must be marketed at once, no farmer is benefited by a home market; because when he takes anything worth raising into the market to sell he has got to have the price fixed for it by the markets of the country.

Now, what burdens are imposed upon the farmers of the country under the present system. And how moderately and modestly the majority on this side of the House propose to reduce them at this time! Look at salt. Every farmer in the United States is bound to have salt. He can not raise his stock without it. There are two hundred and sixty-eight salt manufactories in the United States, according to the census of 1880; and now they are all under one trust. The entire product is fixed by a trust. There are two hundred and sixty-eight manufactories, with a capital of \$8,225,740, and an average number of hands of 4,289; and sixty millions of people every day of their lives pay tribute to these two hundred and sixty-eight manufacturers of salt. Every head of stock in the United States, as it licks its little daily portion of salt to preserve its life, pays tribute to two hundred and sixty-eight manufacturers of salt.

The farmer buys his piece of land and undertakes to improve it by building a house, and every single article he wants to put into that house is taxed in the interest of a monopoly—his lumber \$2 a thousand; his window-glass 61 to 68 per cent. for the smaller sizes and 94 to 108 per cent. for larger sizes of window-glass. Now, there were fifty-eight manufacturers of window-glass in 1880. I have understood there was a convention of them held here some time this winter, and they numbered seventy-two, but in 1880 there were fifty-eight protected by an average of about 65 per cent. for the small sizes of glass, and sixty million of people, as they look out of their windows on the bright light of heaven, have to pay tribute to fifty-eight manufacturers. Every poor man starting in the struggle of life, who tries to build a shelter for his family; every poor man starting in the race with an ambition to own a home of his own—in my judgment the grandest ambition that ever took possession of a young man—before he can put a light into his window must pay 65 per cent. tribute to these fifty-eight manufacturers. And they come and tell us, "If you remove this exorbitant tax, or even cut it down, you will destroy our industry;" and they tried to frighten my friend from Maryland [Mr. RAYNEE] when on the floor by shaking the red flag of window-glass industry at him.

Why, my friend, if you people in Maryland who are engaged in the manufacture of window-glass are not unlike all the other citizens of Maryland, when you tell them that sixty million people are paying tributes to these few glass manufacturers, they will stand by you in your vote upon this bill. Stop their industry? I do not believe a word of it. But suppose it does stop it; if it has got to be subsidized with the blood and the labor of sixty million people, let it go; let it stop. Tell your fifty-eight manufacturers to go and engage in some honorable industry that does not have to be subsidized by the people to make it profitable. Gentlemen talk here about this little industry and that little industry having to stop if we do not subsidize them. Then, in God's name, let them all stop. Let them stop, and go and engage in some honorable business that does not have to take money out of the pockets of the rest of the people in order to make it profitable. That sort of argument has no terrors for me—none in the world. I never could see any sense in robbing one hundred men to make one man rich, and it is nothing but robbery.

Grindstones—there is not a farmer in the United States that can run his farm without a grindstone, and that is taxed, too. Grindstones are taxed about 15 per cent. Linseed oil, which the farmer needs to paint his house and his other buildings, is taxed 54.79 per cent. There is a tax of 76½ per cent. on vinegar, and they call that a protection to the farmer. Some gentlemen on the other side of the House have set forth in their speeches tabular statements in which they include vinegar as a farm product or industry, but I can tell those gentlemen that Yankee industry has wrought a wonderful change of late years in the manner of producing vinegar. It is now a manufacturing industry and in 1880 had 306 establishments in full operation. Vine-

gar made upon the farm has entirely disappeared from the commerce of the country.

Mr. HIRE. Can the gentleman explain to the House upon his principles how it happens that the poor man that he talks about buys his window-glass now under this "oppressive" system cheaper than he bought it under the tariff which was in force in 1861?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, well, if that is true—if the tariff does increase the price to the consumer—why do you want to keep it on?

Mr. BUCHANAN. But if it does not hurt you, why do you want to keep it off?

Mr. HATCH. But it does hurt us; and if you were not afraid you would let us take it off. You want to keep the tariff on because you know that it enhances the profits of the glass manufacturer. If that is not true, what is the sense of keeping it on?

Mr. Chairman, I am admonished that my time has nearly expired. I have a word to say to my political brethren on this side of the House before I close. Gentlemen upon the other side who are opposing the passage of this bill are offering nothing in its stead for the relief of the people. They are divided among themselves upon every proposition, as has been fully explained to the House. They would not dare to vote to-day to repeal the entire internal-revenue taxes. They will not go before the country upon a platform of free whisky and free tobacco, and taxed clothes and taxed window-glass, taxed lumber and taxed salt. I know they will not do it, and it is all hypocrisy and cant to pretend that they will do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. We will try them on it.

Mr. HATCH. It is all hypocrisy and cant, for hypocrisy and cant, like injustice and oppression, find congenial shelter under this robber flag of protection. But, my friends, we are advancing rapidly. In the Forty-eighth Congress a tariff bill had been introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and on the 6th day of May, 1884, after it had been in Committee of the Whole for awhile, the enacting clause was stricken out. Gentlemen would not even wait for the perfecting of the bill under the five-minute rule, but voted to strike out the enacting clause. Again, in the Forty-ninth Congress, they voted against going into Committee of the Whole to even consider a tariff bill. But now we have not only got a tariff bill under discussion, but there is a fair prospect of its passing the House. Moderate and conservative as it is, it will give some relief. It will pass, and I believe that when it comes to the final vote, every Democrat on this side of the House will vote for it.

The gentleman from Michigan, with an assumed irony which I have never heard surpassed, undertook to break the force of that sentence of the President's message which states that it is a condition and not a sentiment that confronts us. Yes, my friends, it is a condition. It is the condition of the agricultural masses of the country that I have undertaken in my feeble way to lay before the House. It is the condition of the great mass of the laboring and producing classes of the country. It is that condition which confronts us to-day; it is one of bondage to these manufacturing establishments; and the time is coming, and that very soon, when the bands of that bondage are to be broken by the action of this House.

Mr. Chairman, for eighteen hundred years that which, more than anything else, has given to the Christian hope and strength in his struggle with the enemies of Christianity has been that grand declaration of Paul to the Phillippians, when he said that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess the divinity of the Saviour and the fundamental truth of the Christian religion. As a Democrat, believing in the power of Democratic principles to relieve our people from this great oppression, I rejoice to-day with exceeding great joy that the time is coming and coming quickly, coming with the first bright days of June, when every Democratic knee in the United States shall bow to the decrees of the overwhelming majority of the Democratic party, and every Democratic tongue shall confess revenue reform as the fundamental principle of the Democratic party. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SYMES. Mr. Chairman, the so-called tariff question has been discussed more in this country than any other. Ever since Alexander Hamilton, the greatest genius of the American financial and industrial policy, made his report in 1789 to the First Congress upon raising and collecting the revenue, the tariff has been the leading topic of discussion and a leading question in the division of political parties. All parties have agreed in the past, and still agree, that the collection of duties on imports is a legal and proper mode of raising the ordinary revenues for the support of the Government. All parties have in the past agreed that direct taxation or internal revenue should be resorted to only in times of great emergencies and when the demands of the Government are greater than it is practicable to levy or raise by taxing foreign imports. The leading American thinkers and statesmen who have risen above the behests of local demands or the temporary exigencies of a political campaign have always held to this fundamental principle of American revenue and taxation. I can not, in my limited time, take a view of and cite from the history of these questions.

But it will not be denied that the statesmen of both parties have never advocated resorting to internal taxation in this country except

in pressing emergencies, and such taxes have been immediately removed when the extraordinary demands that gave rise to them have ceased. Internal or direct taxes have been imposed upon the American people only three times in the history of the Government. The first time was in 1791-'92, and it lasted until 1801. President Jefferson, in his first message to Congress, specially recommended the repeal of these internal taxes, and they were repealed. In his second message he spoke of internal taxation as extraordinary, and only to be resorted to in great emergencies. The war of 1812 with England created such an extraordinary demand on the Treasury that internal taxation had to be again resorted to. So soon as that emergency was over President Monroe in 1817 specially recommended its repeal. No other internal or direct taxes were levied until the war of the rebellion, when they became necessary to assist in the preservation of the Union. So it appears that all internal taxes have been immediately repealed when the demands of the Government made it practicable, with the single exception of the large internal-revenue taxes which have been continued during the past fifteen years.

The repeal or material modification of the present internal taxes has been and is now opposed by the Democratic party. In this, as in many other things, we find the Democrats advocating a policy contrary to the judgment and opinions of the great statesmen from whom they pretend to derive their political principles. Under the leadership of the President they are endeavoring to fasten permanently upon the people of this country a system of internal or direct taxation which is at war with the true theory of the American system. They insist on keeping up this direct tax, with its inquisitorial methods and its 4,000 officers scattered over the country, after the extraordinary emergency under which it was adopted by the Republican party had passed away. Although the demand for this direct taxation seemed imperative when the same was adopted during the war, still it must be doubted whether the people of the country would have indorsed such a system, or Congress have enacted it, if it had even been supposed it was to be a permanent direct-tax system engrafted upon the institutions of this country. It has heretofore been the pride of the American people that they had no inquisitorial direct-tax system characteristic of the governments of Europe; that, having no standing armies in time of peace, the demands for a direct-tax system could only arise to supply deficiencies in time of war or other great emergencies.

Mr. Chairman, there is good reason and the best of causes for this American system of taxation, and the policy of raising substantially all the revenues of the Government in time of peace by duties on imports and resorting to direct taxation only when necessary to meet the extraordinary demands of the Government in time of war. This is the only method by which stability and permanency can be given to the commercial, financial, and industrial interests of the country.

All must concede that a very high tariff, a very low tariff, or a medium tariff will result in establishing, building up, and giving prosperity to or causing the decline or destruction of, as the case may be, many leading industries of the country. If the tariff is to be made by Congress very high or very low, according to temporary emergencies of the Government, it will overthrow all the future prosperity and permanency of our manufacturing and industrial interests. Such a vacillating policy of legislation, depending upon real or imaginary contingencies, or on the opinions of some politician who temporarily occupies the Executive chair, must necessarily subvert and destroy the industrial American system, which supplies the ordinary revenues of the Government, protects American labor, and gives material prosperity to the whole nation.

Mr. Chairman, a change in the permanency of this American system, will remit us to those dark and bankrupt times from 1846 to 1857, brought upon the country by the Democratic party after they had succeeded in defeating the father of the protective system, Henry Clay, by falsely pretending before the people in the Presidential campaign of 1844 they would not repeal the tariff of 1842. The history of that campaign and the course of the Democratic party seems to be repeating itself. The revenue reformers in the last campaign insisted they did not propose to so revise or change the tariff as to interfere with the wages of American workmen or with the great industrial and manufacturing interests. But immediately after the election of the first Democratic President in a quarter of a century, a combined effort is made to so lower the import duties and so add to the free-list that it must result in a great reduction of wages to the laboring men and in the overthrow and destruction of many of the industrial interests of the country. The result of raising the ordinary revenues for the support of the Government by duties on foreign imports must be that many manufacturing, mining, and other industries which furnish raw material to the manufacturers will be protected from foreign competition.

A confidence in the permanency of such a system of taxation has caused hundreds of millions of money to be invested and expended in the erection of permanent plants for manufacturing, mining, and other industries closely allied to them. Millions of artisans and skilled laborers in these protected industries have become dependent upon the prosperity of these factories for the support of themselves and their families. This state of things has continued for a long series of years.

Manufacturing and kindred industries have become permanently established. The capitalists, owners, and operatives in this great system of industries have staked their capital, their enterprise, and their energy upon the permanency of this American system of protection by tariff which has existed for so many years. It can not be said those protective tariffs which have built up these industries were, to any considerable extent, war taxes. It can not be said that those interested had any reason to suppose the new unheard of and untried policy proclaimed by the President and the Democratic party at this time, of reducing the surplus and the revenues by the repeal of the tariff taxes instead of by the abolishment of the internal-revenue system, could have been apprehended. The history of all political parties from the origin of the Government seemed to demonstrate that no such radical change in the American system of finance and taxation would be entertained.

The extraordinary demands of the Government for the revenues collected both from the tariff and internal taxes have ceased. The war has long since ended. The great national debt created by the war has been nearly paid off. A large surplus is accumulating in the Treasury, which must be disposed of, and the revenues of the Government must be reduced. All concede this. There is no conflict of opinion between the two parties upon the proposition that the surplus and the revenues must be reduced. This is the question that confronts us today.

Mr. Chairman, it is the same question which confronted the Government and the people when Jefferson was elected President in 1801. It is the same question that confronted the people and the administration after the election of President Monroe in 1817; and it is the same question that has been before this country practically since the election of the first Democratic House of Representatives in 1874. The Republican party had a majority in the Forty-seventh Congress, and made a revision and reduction of both the tariff and internal taxes. A small portion of the Democratic party since 1874 have advocated that the internal revenues should be reduced as well as the tariff taxes. But after the election of President Cleveland the avowed policy of the party is to maintain permanently the internal-revenue and direct-tax system, and to make such a reduction in the duties on imports and by adding to the free-list that the revenues derived from tariff taxes added to the internal-revenue receipts shall be only sufficient to support the Government.

President Cleveland in his last onslaught upon the protective system and harangue in favor of free trade, by courtesy called his third annual message, specially urges the retaining, permanently, the internal-tax system and the reduction of the revenues of the Government by the repeal of tariff taxes.

The Republican party advocates the repeal or modification of the internal-tax system, because a war measure, and the maintaining of such tax on imports as will not interfere with the prosperity of the manufacturing and other kindred industries depending upon them, and such as will not affect the employment or lower the wages of the American workmen.

The position of the President and his party is entirely impracticable, if we should admit that it was politic. The Republican party claims that the tariff should be equitably and properly revised, and some reductions made so as to correct the inequalities and suit it to the industrial changes that have taken place since the Republicans last revised it in the Forty-seventh Congress. But they are opposed to making such a reduction of the tariff as would reduce the surplus in the Treasury and the revenues to the ordinary needs of the Government, without also a large reduction of the internal revenues.

To attempt to reduce the tariff taxes to the extent of seventy-five millions a year, which is necessary, if no reduction of internal revenue is made, would destroy American industries and impoverish American labor. Only theoretical free-traders, Bourbon Democrats, or those as deficient in information upon these economic subjects as the President seems to be, would proclaim such a policy or attempt such a task.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1888 to be \$383,000,000 and the actual expenditures at \$316,000,000. Of this the receipts from customs are two hundred and twenty-eight million, from internal revenue one hundred and twenty millions, and miscellaneous thirty-five millions. How can a reduction of seventy-five millions be made in the two hundred and twenty-eight millions of import duties without so reducing protective duties as to flood the country with the products of cheap foreign labor, close many manufacturing and kindred industries, and throw millions of laboring men out of employment. We have listened to and we have heard many free-trade revenue reform speeches to learn how it was proposed to accomplish this object so urgently recommended by the President and his followers in Congress, but it has not been pointed out in any practicable way.

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

Mr. Chairman, what is raw material? If there is a phrase in the English language that has been and now is abstractly and deceitfully used, it is "free raw material." Congress and the people have been treated to an exceedingly large supply of very free and very raw material on this tariff question of late. It has certainly been free enough and raw enough

to suit the most ultra free-trader. For the past three weeks it has come forth in this Hall "like the outbursting of a fountain from the earth, with original, spontaneous, and native force." It has issued forth as free and as raw as the whisky that oozes through the worm of the illicit distillery in the most reliable Democratic free-trade districts.

The President insists upon free raw material. He says:

The radical reduction of the duties upon raw material used in manufacture or its importation is, of course, an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these articles. It would not only relieve them from the increased cost caused by the tariff on such material, but the manufactured product being itself cheapened, that part of the tariff now laid upon such products as a compensation to our manufacturers for the present price of raw material could be accordingly modified. Such reduction or free importation would serve largely to reduce the revenue. It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers.

The President here shows his want of comprehension of the whole tariff system. In one paragraph he persuades the farmers that the tariff which protects the manufacturer is a great wrong to them. In another paragraph he attempts to show the manufacturer that he will be benefited by putting what he calls "raw material" upon the free-list. The President forgets or ignores the fact that putting "raw material" on the free-list would ruin many of the great agricultural, mining, and other industries of this country.

The President and his party claim that their special object is to reduce the revenue without injuring any of the great industries of the country. If all the dutiable articles now imported, generally referred to as raw material, were put upon the free-list it would reduce the revenue only about twelve millions. The following table shows the amount of duties collected on the different dutiable raw materials imported during the year 1886:

Coal-tar dyes.....	\$522,686	Hops.....	\$217,917
Potash.....	104,716	Iron ore.....	525,193
Soda.....	1,448,263	Marble.....	229,672
Coal.....	581,600	Salt.....	706,324
Copper ore.....	108,096	Lumber.....	867,849
Hemp.....	194,136	Zinc.....	88,900
Manila.....	626,895	Wool.....	5,126,108
Jute.....	293,788		
Sisal-grass.....	493,751	Total.....	12,419,699
Hay.....	184,351		

Place all of these articles upon the free-list and it would almost destroy the wool, flax, hemp, and jute industries of the farmer, greatly depress the trade and production of lumber, and depreciate the value of the iron and copper mining and coal industries. Still it is claimed that the paramount object is to reduce the revenue. Then, why does not the Mills bill put sugar on the free-list and pay a bounty to the producers? The revenue collected on sugar and molasses amounts to about sixty millions per annum. It is a necessary article of food to 60,000,000 people. Here 60,000,000 people are taxed about \$1 per head to protect a very small industry. I would build up the sugar industry in this country. I would pay such bounties to the producers of sugar from cane, from sorghum, and from the sugar-beet as would make it profitable and an object to build up this industry for the future benefit of this country. But I would not tax a necessary article of food \$63,000,000 per annum for this purpose. I would at least reduce the tariff on sugar until the revenue collected should be only sufficient to pay bounties to insure its production and build up the industry. If there were no other purely revenue and direct taxes that could be repealed sufficient to reduce the revenue to the required amount for the economical administration of the Government I would put sugar on the free-list and pay the bounty direct from the Treasury. Putting sugar on the free-list or so reducing the tariff as to derive only a sufficient revenue to pay bounties on the American production will reduce the surplus revenue \$40,000,000 more than putting all raw materials on the free-list.

The more we examine this bill the more we are forced to the conclusion that its object is to bring about free trade more than a reduction of the revenue. The more it is scrutinized in detail the more it will be found that the duties on the articles which produce mostly a revenue tariff are not so diminished as to reduce the revenue in a material degree. It is simply an attack upon the protective system and goes as far in the direction of free trade as its authors dare go with any hope of passing the measure.

The free-trader says, "England and other European countries admit raw materials free." So they do, because they have not got and can not produce the quantities of raw material they must have. These free-traders will not understand the breadth and the illimitable extent and variety of the resources of our country. To buy raw material abroad when it is found to an unlimited extent at home because England and other European countries are compelled to buy it for want of a sufficient quantity accords with other free-trade fallacies. Our country produces nearly every kind of raw material, and the few classes which can not be produced here are now on the free-list. They seem to forget that our country produces every article that flourishes between the torrid and frigid zone, from the orange of Florida and California to the lakes of ice in Maine and Minnesota; that the traveler in our country may now in the course of a few days, by the agency of steam, gather samples of every variety of cereals, fruits, and mineral productions which he could formerly find in a voyage around the world. It would

be folly to try and enforce a material and industrial policy upon this country because it has been followed by the government of an island that might be laid down within one of our States or Territories. It is only the Bourbonism of the free-trader or the Anglomania of the college professor and Mugwump that could seriously contemplate such a policy.

FREE TRADE HAS INJURED ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, it might be supposed from the continued statements of the free-traders, by courtesy called-revenue reformers, that the manufacturing and agricultural classes of England had been benefited and had prospered under free trade. Our large importing merchants, who make great fortunes by bringing into this country the products of cheap foreign labor and selling it in competition with the products of our better-paid labor, refer us to England as illustrating the benefits of free trade. That class of capitalists who represent English capital and seek investments in the character of business enterprises which are aided and made monopolies by the grants of special privileges and franchises from both our State and National Governments, and who receive unduly large profits and dividends which are sent across the ocean to enrich English capitalists, all cite you to England to show the benign influence of free trade.

All those college professors and theoretical free-traders who obtain their ideas and thoughts from English free-trade writers, who know nothing of the practical workings and results of free trade in England or of protection in this country, cry out for free trade, and refer to England to prove their theories. Every Bourbon Democratic politician who has slept a Rip Van Winkle sleep for the last quarter of a century, and has learned nothing from the actual workings and results of the protective policy in this country, or of free trade elsewhere, flippantly asserts that free trade has worked beneficially in England.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that free trade in England has proved very injurious, and has blighted the former prosperity of her industrial and laboring classes.

There are many reasons why a protective tariff should exist in this country above all others. The institutions of our country, the political status and equality of all men, whether laborers or millionaires, the diversified and illimitable character of our natural resources, the variety of climate and products, and the necessity that our working classes should receive much higher wages than those of other countries make a protective policy indispensable. Still it can be shown that a universal free-trade policy has injured England and Ireland, and given to their continental neighbors important advantages over them.

DEPRESSION OF TRADE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, in 1885 a royal commission was appointed to inquire into the depression of trade and industry in England. It was composed of thirteen prominent business men, economists, and statesmen. It made an exhaustive inquiry into the causes of the depression, and examined as witnesses leading economists and business men. It extended its inquiries through its foreign service to all countries. It made from time to time, during the year 1886, reports of the testimony of witnesses and of the answers of laboring and commercial organizations to its questions. The last report was made in December, 1886. The whole work consists of five parts and of over 2,000 large pages. It covers the entire field of British trade and industry and their relations to other countries. The conclusions of these very able commissioners set forth in their final report on the causes of the depression and continued decline of British trade and industry should be studied by every free-trader.

I obtained this report in parts, as it was issued from time to time in 1886. I examined it with care. I wanted to find out why it was that the country to which we are always referred by college professors, Bourbon Democrats, Mugwumps, and other free-traders as the model of industrious and commercial prosperity admitted such a continued depression and languishing of its trade and manufactures as to require a special commission to expend much time and money in investigating the causes. The commissioners assign among others two special causes of the depression: the protective tariff which they say has built up the manufacturing industries of the United States, and to a large extent excluded foreign importations; and the protective tariffs of Germany and other European countries, which have not only excluded British goods, but have also resulted in large importations of manufactured goods into England from Germany, Austria, and other countries. They conclude that not only has England's foreign market been partially taken away from her by protective tariffs, but that her home market is being seriously injured by the foreign competition of nations whose industries have been built up by protective tariffs.

The commission says in its final report:

We are disposed to think that one of the chief agencies which have tended to perpetuate this state of things is the protectionist policy of so many foreign countries which has become more marked during the last ten years than in any previous period of any similar length. The high prices which protection secures the producer within the protected area naturally stimulates the production and impels him to engage in competition in foreign markets.

The commission also speaks of foreign competition in their home market as one of the causes of depression, and says:

An effect of a similar kind, though less in degree, has been produced by the increased competition in our own market of foreign manufactured and partly manufactured goods, the importation of which appears to grow at a more rapid rate than population.

In dealing with the results of the depression the commission says:

We have observed above that the complaint proceeds chiefly from the classes who are more immediately and directly concerned in production, and there can be no doubt that of the wealth annually created in the country a smaller proportion falls to the share of the employers of labor than formerly. The diminution in the rate of profit obtainable from production, from agriculture and manufacturing, has given rise to a widespread feeling of depression among the producing classes. It is from these classes, and especially from the employers of labor, that the complaint chiefly proceeds.

Those, on the other hand, who are in receipt of fixed salaries, who draw their incomes from fixed investments, have comparatively little to complain of. Those classes of population who derive their income from foreign investments or from property not directly connected with foreign industries, appear to have little ground of complaint. On the contrary, they have profited by the remarkably low prices of many commodities.

Mr. Chairman, it is the capitalists, the monopolists, the importing merchants, and those who derive large fixed incomes from bonds and other investments who are and who have always been clamoring for free trade in this country. It is from the employers of labor, from the workmen who produce the products and build up the industries of the country that the demand comes for a protective tariff. We can not quote further from this very able report or cite the testimony which supports its conclusions. When leading English statesmen and economists and manufacturers describe as two of the prominent causes of the admitted depression and declining state of England's trade and industries to be foreign tariffs and bounties and foreign competition with continental nations as the result of those tariffs, why do Democrats ignore these facts and ask for free trade?

We have also learned from this report that it is not alone English competition that demands a protective tariff in this country. If England, with her advantages as a manufacturing nation, and considering the condition of her laboring people as compared with that of the American workman, is being injured by competition with the products of European and Asiatic labor through her free-trade policy, how can America open her markets to the manufactures and labor of Germany, France, and other European nations? If England suffers from free importations of the continental nations, what will become of America when subjected to the same foreign competition?

Sir Edward Sullivan, a member of the British Parliament, has written a very able and practical work upon the destructive effects which foreign competition by free trade has brought upon English industries. The English laboring classes occupy somewhat an intermediate position between the American and those of the continental nations of Europe. The result has been that large importations into England of the products of cheaper labor have greatly depressed English manufactures. Mr. Sullivan states this result as follows:

The labor problem in this country (*i. e.*, in England) is easily stated; but its solution is another matter. A, B, C, D, E, and F are industrial communities, all having the same or nearly the same advantages of material, machinery, etc., but in B, C, D, E, and F wages are from 20 to 50 to 70 per cent. lower than in A; and moreover, the workmen in B, C, D, E, and F work much longer hours and are more thrifty than the workmen in A, and consequently most manufactured articles are produced cheaper in B, C, D, E, and F than in A.

If therefore B, C, D, E, and F are allowed to send into A's markets, duty free, anything they can produce cheaper than A can, it is evident they must undersell A, and the employment of A's workmen will be destroyed. There can be no mistake about this; it must be so and it is so. It is just what is happening. In France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Russia, Egypt, and India the workers work for from 20 to 70 per cent. less wages and about 20 per cent. longer hours. * * * The result is that, all other conditions being equal, they can produce almost everything cheaper than we can. And this they are doing; and our free-traders, in illustration of the warning that a certain person "always finds work for idle hands to do," are working night and day to devise further means to enable them to deliver their cheap goods in our markets at the lowest possible cost, and their efforts are completely successful. Every year the delivery of foreign goods enormously increases, and every year the employment of our workers enormously diminishes; and this is very simple.

It would happen to France, Germany, etc., if they were fools enough to follow our example. * * * The less fitted our working people are by habit, by education, and example to hold the lists of cheap labor against the world, the more important becomes our duty to protect them. It is not indeed a question whether we wish to do so or not. We must do so. Our workers must have work. It is childish nonsense talking about theory and appealing to figures and returns in a case of this sort, when the wolf is at the door. There is the fact that is patent to all the world that there are half a dozen industrial communities who can all produce their goods cheaper than we can, and owing to bonuses and preferential railroad rates, advocated by our free-traders, can actually deliver them in our markets at less cost than we can produce them. Now, what are we to do? Are we to listen to the dictates of common sense, of self-preservation, of national duty, of natural affection, and protect the industries of our work-people and prevent them being pauperized and forced to leave the country, or are we to listen to the blatant folly of the free-trade popes and let the industrial interests of our workers slide? No one can come near your free-trader for selfishness and want of sympathy.

Mr. Chairman, this is the clear and consummate statement of an Englishman upon the blighting effects of free trade on the industrial interests of England in her relation to her continental neighbors. The same statement applies with greater force as to what would be the results upon this country of free trade with England, and in a greater degree of free trade between this country and the continental nations of Europe.

Mr. Sullivan says that in England there are 34,000,000 people—30,-

000,000 who are dependent on work, and 4,000,000 who are dependent on capital; that no doubt—

protection to labor, that is, protection to the 30,000,000 who live by labor, will make things dearer to the 4,000,000 who live by capital. * * * But which most concerns the prosperity, even the existence, of the whole community of 34,000,000; that the 30,000,000 should be employed and able to live and thrive, or that the 4,000,000 should live in greater luxury and that the 30,000,000 should starve or leave the country? It is only free-trade enthusiasts who could entertain the question; but they do. * * * A duty of 10 per cent. on the production of foreign workers would give work to 30,000,000 of workers. "Perhaps," say the free-traders, "but then our poor capitalists would have to pay 20 per cent. more for their luxuries."

Mr. Chairman, some of our free-trade statesmen had better study the actual result of free trade in England before they try to impose its curses upon this country. The free-trade theorists say that we must have free trade to supply a foreign market. Do not these American free-traders know that the production of the world exceeds the consumption of the world; that the old countries of the world are overcrowded with the products of cheap labor; that if it were not for the protective tariff our country would be flooded with these products; that many classes of our manufacturing industries would cease, and our laboring people be thrown out of employment; that there would be no room for the hundreds of thousands of foreign immigrants to find work, and that our country would be filled with tramps to a greater extent than it was after the panic of 1873?

The protectionists in America, France, Belgium, Germany, and Austria, state as a premise that the production of the world exceeds the consumption of the world and therefore they must take steps to prevent their markets from being swamped by the surplus productions of the world. In other words, they must protect their industries against the foreign competition of the world. It is the first duty of a nation to protect its own laboring people and its own industries from the competition of the outside world. A nation that will not do it must suffer the consequences.

Mr. Sullivan again says:

In every industrial country in the world except England it is recognized that the first duty of a government is to promote the employment of the people; in other words, to protect their industries. In every other industrial country but England the industries of the people are protected. Is it so certain that all the whole world is wrong and England only right? In every country except England it is allowed that the interests of those who both produce and consume are greater than the interests of those who consume. In every industrial community out of England it is allowed that employment is of more importance than mere cheapness. In England alone it is maintained that cheapness is of more importance than employment.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this statement of this very able and learned English economist to the Democratic free-traders in this country. Will they learn nothing from the experience of other nations? Will they not recognize the fact here stated that free trade does not exist in any country except England and Ireland? Do they not know that the protective policy has been adopted by the statesmen of Germany and other nations of Europe as absolutely necessary to their industrial and material prosperity? Will they not recognize the fact that Germany, Austria, Russia, Belgium, and France have been watching and protecting the industrial and manufacturing interests of their countries, especially during the last few years, wherever they were likely to be injured by competition with others? Do they not know that so soon as the manufacturing and industrial skill and enterprise of America produce any particular character of goods so as to be able to compete in a limited degree with the markets of Germany, of France, and of Austria, that when it is made known in those countries, such protective import duties and regulations are immediately adopted as to prevent the American foreign competition? This is the foreign policy which has been and is being adopted, and it should satisfy the free-traders that relying upon a foreign market exists only in theory and can not exist as a fact.

PROTECTION HAS LOWERED THE PRICE OF MANUFACTURED GOODS TO THE CONSUMER.

The free-traders are continually stating that import duties are a tax upon the consumer alone, and that all manufactured articles or raw materials which are protected result in advancing the price to the extent of the tax collected. The President, exhibiting his sublime want of knowledge upon this subject, states in his message that—

These laws (tariff laws) as their primary and plain effect raise the price to the consumer of all articles imported and subject to duty precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles.

The gentlemen upon the other side of the House have stated and even assumed this to be true in the face of all the facts to the contrary. After the above statement by the President, we can not help but admire what he says shortly afterwards in the same message to the effect that—

This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume imported articles and create a tax upon all our people.

It is fortunate that one who shows such an entire want of knowledge upon the subject does not make his assertions "by way of instruction" to anybody, because instruction from such sources could not fail to mislead all who relied upon it.

Many illustrations to show the error of this position can be made. I will refer to only a few.

Russian sheet-iron sold at 18 cents per pound in this country for many years before its manufacture in this country; under a protective duty of 2½ cents per pound manufactures for American sheet-iron were established and put into competition with the Russian. Russian sheet-iron has fallen to 9½ cents per pound and American sheet-iron is sold for still less. The skilled workmen employed in this industry are paid very high wages. The Russian workmen are paid very low wages. Thus, the American consumer saves 8½ cents per pound on every pound of sheet-iron he buys. But, according to the statement of the President and his followers, the 2½ cents per pound should be added to the price before the tariff and sheet-iron would sell for 20½ cents per pound. If the tariff tax were taken off and the American sheet-iron factories closed the product of the low wages of Russia would again flood the country and prices would advance, because there would be no local competition.

The lead-mining industry furnishes another strong illustration that the protection which builds up and prospers important industries, at the same time creates a competition with the foreign articles, which reduces the price to the consumer. The following table, from The Mineral Resources of the United States for 1886, shows the production of lead in the United States from 1825 to 1886:

Years.	Total production.	Desilverized lead.	Non-argentiferous lead.	Percentage of desilverized lead.
	Short tons.	Short tons.	Short tons.	Per cent.
1825.....	1,500			
1830.....	8,000			
1831.....	7,500			
1832.....	10,000			
1833.....	11,000			
1834.....	12,000			
1835.....	13,000			
1836.....	15,000			
1837.....	13,500			
1838.....	15,000			
1839.....	17,500			
1840.....	17,000			
1841.....	20,500			
1842.....	24,000			
1843.....	25,000			
1844.....	26,000			
1845.....	30,000			
1846.....	28,000			
1847.....	28,000			
1848.....	25,000			
1849.....	23,500			
1850.....	22,000			
1851.....	18,500			
1852.....	15,700			
1853.....	16,800			
1854.....	16,500			
1855.....	15,800			
1856.....	16,000			
1857.....	15,800			
1858.....	15,300			
1859.....	16,400			
1860.....	15,600			
1861.....	14,100			
1862.....	14,200			
1863.....	14,800			
1864.....	15,300			
1865.....	14,700			
1866.....	16,100			
1867.....	15,200			
1868.....	16,400			
1869.....	17,500			
1870.....	17,830			
1871.....	20,000			
1872.....	25,880			
1873.....	42,540	20,150	22,381	47.7
1874.....	54,080			
1875.....	59,640	34,909	24,699	58.5
1876.....	64,070	37,649	26,421	58.8
1877.....	81,900	50,748	31,152	62.0
1878.....	91,000	64,290	26,770	70.6
1879.....	92,780	64,650	28,130	69.7
1880.....	97,825	70,135	27,690	71.7
1881.....	117,055	86,315	30,770	73.7
1882.....	132,890	103,375	29,015	78.3
1883.....	143,957	122,157	21,800	84.8
1884.....	139,897	119,965	19,832	86.4
1885.....	129,412	107,437	21,975	83.0
1886.....	135,629	114,829	20,800	85.0

It will be seen from this table that the production was unimportant for many years. It was only 1,500 tons in 1825. It only reached 25,800 tons in 1872, and it increased to 97,800 tons in 1880, and to 135,600 tons in 1886. This wonderful increase in the production of lead caused by the great development of the mining and smelting industries in the Rocky Mountain States and Territories resulted in a great reduction in price to the consumers. Although the consumption has increased 300 per cent. in the past fifteen years, and although a very large proportion of the price paid by the consumers is absorbed by the railroad and transportation companies, the price has been reduced to the consumer about 30 per cent.

The following table shows the average prices of lead in New York from 1870 to 1886, inclusive:

Highest and lowest prices of lead at New York City, monthly, from 1870 to 1886, inclusive.
[Cents per pound.]

Years.	January.		February.		March.	
	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
1870.....	*6.30	6.20	6.25	6.17	6.20	6.10
1871.....	*6.30†	6.15	6.25	6.20	6.20	6.15
1872.....	*6.00	5.90	6.00	5.87	6.00	5.87
1873.....	*6.37	6.25	6.50	6.40	6.50	6.25
1874.....	*6.00	5.90	6.25	6.00	6.25	6.12
1875.....	*6.20	6.00	5.90	5.85	5.75	5.62
1876.....	*6.00	5.87	6.37	6.00	6.75	6.40
1877.....	†6.15	6.12	6.40	6.20	6.50	6.40
1878.....	4.35	4.00	3.87	3.65	3.87	3.62
1879.....	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.25
1880.....	6.10	5.50	6.00	5.87	5.95	5.30
1881.....	5.00	4.80	5.10	4.80	4.85	4.62
1882.....	5.15	4.95	5.20	5.00	5.12	4.85
1883.....	4.70	4.60	4.60	4.50	4.65	4.50
1884.....	4.50	3.75	4.10	3.75	4.15	4.10
1885.....	3.70	3.55	3.70	3.60	3.70	3.62½
1886.....	4.70	4.50	4.90	4.60	4.95	4.85

Years.	April.		May.		June.	
	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
1870.....	6.25	6.15	6.25	6.20	6.25	6.20
1871.....	6.20	6.10	6.18	6.10	6.15	6.12
1872.....	6.12	5.90	6.62	6.25	6.62	6.40
1873.....	6.50	6.25	6.62	6.35	6.55	6.12
1874.....	5.25	5.90	6.00	5.75	6.00	5.62
1875.....	5.87	5.80	5.95	5.90	5.90	5.75
1876.....	6.40	6.12	6.50	6.10	6.50	6.25
1877.....	6.50	6.25	6.00	5.55	5.70	5.60
1878.....	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.12
1879.....	3.25	2.87	3.12	2.87	3.12	2.87
1880.....	5.75	5.40	5.25	4.40	4.75	4.50
1881.....	4.85	4.37	4.70	4.25	4.50	4.25
1882.....	5.00	4.90	4.85	4.60	4.90	4.55
1883.....	4.62	4.40	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.40
1884.....	4.05	3.62½	3.75	3.52½	3.65	3.57½
1885.....	3.70	3.62½	3.75	3.60	3.85	3.62½
1886.....	4.90	4.65	4.75	4.65	4.90	4.65

* Gold.

† Currency.

From this it will be seen that in 1870, when this country produced only 17,830 tons of lead, the price was \$6.25 per hundred in New York, and in 1884, when the production was 139,897 tons, the average price in New York was from \$3.65 to \$3.57 per hundred. The consumption of lead has almost kept pace with the great increase in production. With the exception of 1878 and 1879, when considerable quantities of lead were sent to China, the export of lead has been small as compared with the home consumption.

The tariff on lead since the act of March 3, 1883, has been \$2 per hundred on lead in pigs, bars, and blocks.

By the Mills tariff bill this is reduced to one and one-quarter cents per pound or \$1.25 per hundred. The margin of profit on lead ore and smelting, and particularly on lead and silver ore which produces desilverized lead, is very small. This reduction of three-quarters of a cent per pound, \$15 per ton, would enable the Spaniards with their cheap labor and cheap mining and smelting of lead to glut the American market and greatly cripple, if not practically destroy, the great lead industry of the United States.

The value of the lead production of the United States has increased from about \$3,000,000 in 1872 to about twelve millions in 1887. This industry has been built up in a part of the United States that before was almost a desert. It has quickened and vitalized the agricultural, commercial, transportation, and other kindred industry of a permanent nature in the Western and Rocky Mountain country. Vast regions of the public domain would have remained undeveloped on account of inaccessibility and distance from seashore markets but for the building up of this great industry. It has added to the wealth of the nation. It is estimated that it has added to the wealth of the nation a sum almost equal to the principal which has been paid on the national debt. The lead industry supplies a better market for the products of the manufacturer, the farmer, and every industry west of the Missouri than any other interest. It has supplied to railroads and transportation companies an amount of freight traffic without which they could not have paid interest on their bonds. Forty dollars per ton is deducted in Salt Lake City from the New York price of lead,

which the railroads and the Eastern refineries absorb. The following table shows the amount of transportation and freight created by the ore-producing lead and smelting industries in the Western and Rocky Mountain region:

Railway tonnage of the Union Pacific system in the mountain country, the Utah Central Railway, and the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railway for 1887.

Freights.	Tonnage.	Percent.
	<i>Pounds.</i>	
Merchandise, etc., received.....	1,831,581,647	94.895
Merchandise, etc., forwarded.....	1,718,453,429	75.895
Ores and bullion received.....	98,542,535	5.105
Ores and bullion forwarded.....	414,759,273	24.135
Ores, bullion, and merchandise received at smelting and mining stations.....	1,018,333,893	55.599
Ores, bullion, and merchandise forwarded from smelting and mining stations.....	1,304,595,166	73.909

Grand total of merchandise, etc., ores, and bullion received and forwarded from all stations, 4,063,376,884 pounds.

Grand total of merchandise, etc., ores, and bullion received and forwarded from smelting and mining stations, 2,322,844,059 pounds, or 57.140 per cent.

A glance at this table shows that a great depression in or a partial destruction of the lead-mining industry of the Rocky Mountains would, in a great measure, destroy the prosperity of that region.

It has caused the construction of thousands of miles of railroad across the desert, through the cañons, and over the mountains. As the volume of the production has increased it is shown that the price has fallen. The average wages to miners and laborers in the lead mines of Utah, Colorado, and other portions of the Rocky Mountain country is \$3 per day, while the lead-miners of Spain, with which the reduction of the tariff would bring them in direct competition, is about 50 cents per day.

It is not a raw material in any correct sense of the word. The ore from which the lead is smelted lies in the mountains as valueless as the ordinary stone until millions of dollars are invested in the sinking of shafts, the erection of mining machinery, pumps, and the costly plants of the great smelting works. The plants and machinery at the large lead and silver producing mines in Colorado, Utah, and other places cost more money than many of the greatest manufacturing establishments in the East. The great smelters of Denver and Pueblo in Colorado, of Salt Lake and other cities of the Rocky Mountains are among the most expensive establishments in the world. The United States consumed, in 1887, 164,000 tons of lead, which, at \$70 per ton, amounts to over \$11,000,000. If the proposed reduction of the tariff on lead is made a large portion of this sum would have to be sent abroad in gold, for the lead would be imported from countries with which we have little trade.

PLATE-GLASS.

In 1864 a duty was imposed on plate-glass of from 3 to 60 cents per square foot. It was a duty for revenue only because no polished plate-glass was produced in this country prior to 1870. The cost to consumers before this was from \$2 to \$2.50 per square foot for such polished plate as was generally used in this country. Between 1868 and 1875 extensive manufactories were established at New Albany, Louisville, Butler, Pa, and Crystal City, near St. Louis, and others, on account of this tariff. The home competition by the building up of this industry has reduced the price to consumers about \$1 per square foot, or about one-half. Still, the President asserts in substance that the duty on plate-glass must make it cost to the consumer over 50 per cent. more. Before the industry was created in this country the plate-glass trade was controlled by a few importers in New York, who, in combination with the foreign manufacturers, maintained a monopoly upon it. Mr. Sullivan, in his work on English free trade hereinbefore referred to, shows how the free importation of plate-glass from the Continent has destroyed that industry in England; and he points out how it is one of the most beneficial industries to any community or country.

IMPORTING CHEAP GOODS IS POVERTY TO THE IMPORTERS.

The theory that a country or people may prosper or profit by buying the products from foreign countries because they can be produced cheaper abroad is an absurd free-trade fallacy. The revenue reformer says: Why, if these foreigners can sell us their manufactured goods cheaper than we can produce them, we can profit by buying them and importing them. This doctrine ignores the fact that the more diversified the industries of a community or country are the more it will prosper and the richer it will grow. It ignores the fact that money sent out of a country to pay for imported goods, with a few exceptions, makes that country so much the poorer.

Suppose a community has been manufacturing and selling in the home market \$1,000,000 worth of goods at a fair profit, because there was a protective tariff of 20 per cent. on the article. This tariff is repealed and the same million dollars' worth of goods is imported and sold for \$800,000. The free-trader says that the community has saved \$200,000 by purchasing these goods. Let us see. In the first case one

hundred men were employed in the factories. This directly increased the population of the village over 300. Many small farmers in the vicinity prospered by furnishing these operatives with "garden stuff" and farm products. The erection of the factories in the first place doubled the value of their farms and additional shops of all kinds have been opened. The tailor, the shoemaker, and the bonnet-maker, and any number of trades prospered directly and indirectly by the manufacture and sale of this \$1,000,000 worth of goods.

The owners of the factories, perhaps, live in the neighborhood, and their 10 per cent. profit of \$100,000 a year is expended there; twenty-five thousand in living expenses and seventy-five thousand by investing in real estate, in building improvements or extending their factories, and in employing more labor. The owners and operatives pay a share of the taxes to support the village school, the county, State, and municipal government. Suddenly the free-traders repeal the 20 per cent. tariff. The operatives can not accept low enough wages to compete with foreign goods. The factories are closed, and one hundred men are thrown out of employment. The farmer has no market for his "truck." The tailor, the shoemaker, and the bonnet-maker shops are closed. The owners of the factories take what capital they can save from the wreck and go elsewhere seeking investment. The little farms depreciate 50 per cent. in value; town lots, houses, and shops are almost worthless. The community becomes suddenly bankrupt, its people scattered, and some of them tramps looking for an existence.

They complain that the repeal of the 20 per cent. tariff has ruined their industries and them. The free-trader says, "No; you do not understand the true principle of political economy or you would see that buying the million dollars' worth of articles that were manufactured in the foreign country actually saves to the people \$200,000, because the million dollars' worth of goods now actually costs only \$800,000 to the consumers." "But," says the intelligent American operative, "that \$800,000 has gone to the laborers of a foreign land. We are deprived of the means of subsistence and the country is \$800,000 poorer. You may say that we can buy these and other kinds of goods a little cheaper but we have nothing to buy with. We are seeking work at reduced wages and can find none." The free-trader says again, "You must seek employment in another trade or business where foreign competition and the low wages of other countries can not compete with and destroy your industries."

If the Democratic free-trader can succeed in reducing the tariff as they propose, it will overthrow and destroy the manufactures, the industries of our country, pauperize the laboring classes, and impoverish the whole country in the same manner as when applied, by illustration, to this little community.

FREE TRADE IS SIMPLY FOREIGN COMPETITION.

As Mr. Sullivan says in applying the subject to England:

Frederated from the cloud of words, the platitudes, theories, and sophisms by which it will be assailed, the question before the country is simply this: Can a manufacturing country like England, whose products are excluded from the markets of Europe and America, continue to admit, duty free, the manufactured products of those countries without interfering with the general employment of our people? * * * The bankers, the merchants, the brokers, the agents, the shippers, and those who deal with money and with exchanges in the sale and transportation of foreign goods will say "yes;" and so will those with realized and fixed incomes, the drones of the community, the consumers of silks, of satins, and light wines and a thousand and one articles of luxury that we get from abroad. But if you ask the great body of producers, the capitalists, who have invested their money in manufacturing and similar enterprises, the great employers of labor, the operatives, the toilers and molders, the working bees of our teeming hives of industry, they will say "no."

This statement is specially applicable to the condition of America. Can we, after having under the protective policy built up manufacturing industries and when our products as fast as they come into competition with the products of other nations in foreign markets are excluded therefrom by the protective tariffs of those countries, admit, duty free, the products of those countries without interfering with the general employment of our people? The prosperity of a community must depend upon the general employment of its people and the rate of wages paid. As said, general employment and good wages mean contentment, sobriety, self-respect, and the general progress and improvement of the working classes. The want of them mean the reverse of all this. General employment at good wages is what creates industrial prosperity and adds to the wealth of a country. It is far more important to a community than cheap goods of any kind.

The destruction of a few great manufactures by repealing the tariff on their products causes many other industries to languish. The prosperity of a few great industries causes many others to prosper. The industries of a country are so closely connected and interwoven that you can not injure a few of them without injuring a great many of them. Any system or policy that will injure the manufacturing interests will injure the agricultural interests, the mining interests, and the great trade of internal commerce. These great industries must stand or fall together. By free trade and foreign competition they will fall.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] made the statement that the question narrowed itself to a contest between the drunkard's appetite and the poor man's back, attempting to convey the idea that the poor man had to pay a higher price for a suit of clothes than before the tariffs of 1861-'62, but that the tax on distilled

spirits was not a tax on the poor man. He ignores the fact that of the sixty millions of tax paid on distilled spirits every year, it is estimated that about thirty millions is for alcohol and other spirits used in the industries, fifteen millions of which is consumed in chemical manufactures. Here is a tax on raw material used in domestic industries larger than the total duty paid on all foreign raw material. There is no doubt that the consumer pays this. England takes the tax off of spirits when used in the industries. Germany refunds it all, and France a part, when it is used under the same conditions. Industrial alcohol is used free in Italy and Austria.

But the American free-trader requires these useful industries to pay over \$95 for a barrel of spirits, more than four times its intrinsic value, which would be less than \$20 if the tax was removed from this raw material. The poor man pays this when he buys anything at the family drug-store. The principle of taxing liquor which is used as a beverage is not opposed; but no one but a blind free-trader bent upon ruining the manufacturing industries would insist on continuing the tax on alcohol and other spirits used in the arts and industries. The poor man pays less per yard for a good class of American cassimeres to-day than he did for a poor quality of English cassimeres before the tariff. A stated and balanced account will show that the wages of a laboring man would buy him and his family 50 per cent. more of the necessaries and luxuries of life in the American market than they would in 1859-'60. The same account stated and balanced correctly shows that an equivalent amount of farm produce will purchase for the farmer and his family 50 per cent. more of the necessaries and comforts of life than it would in 1859-'60. Such statements as those made by the gentleman from Tennessee are only calculated to deceive.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF BENEFITS THE FARMER.

Mr. Chairman, it is continually stated that the farmer gets none of the benefits and bears an undue proportion of the burdens of protection. The President, in his annual onslaught on the tariff, by courtesy called his annual message, attempts to sympathize with the farmer. He says:

The farmer and agriculturist, who manufactures nothing, but who pays the increased price which the tariff imposes upon every agricultural implement, upon all he wears, on all he uses and owns, except upon the increase of his flocks and herds and such things as his husbandry produces from the soil, is invited to aid in maintaining the present situation.

The free trade that first existed, which it was supposed would benefit the farmers, was the repeal of the tariff on wheat, corn, and provisions by England, known as the corn law. Every free-trader and Cobden Club man in England said that this would greatly benefit the laboring man, thereby giving him a cheap loaf, and every one of their blind followers in this country said that it would prove of immense benefit to the American farmer by enhancing the price and furnishing a foreign market for his grain and provisions. It did open the markets of England and Ireland free to the products of the American farmer. What has been the result? During the last ten years there has been a continual decrease in the amount of wheat exported and the export price has continually depreciated. The following table from the report of the Bureau of Statistics shows the number of bushels of wheat exported from the United States and the export price for the seven fiscal years from June, 1879, to June, 1886, inclusive:

Years.	Bushels.	Value.	Average price per bushel.
1879-'80	153,252,795	\$190,546,305	\$1.244
1880-'81	150,565,477	167,698,485	1.114
1881-'82	95,271,802	112,929,718	1.185
1882-'83	106,385,828	119,879,341	1.127
1883-'84	70,349,012	75,026,678	1.066
1884-'85	84,653,714	72,933,097	0.862
1885-'86	57,759,209	50,262,715	0.870

Our decrease in exports during this period, according to the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, is as follows:

Years.	Bushels.	Value.
1879-'80	159,565,477	\$167,698,485
1886	57,759,209	50,262,715
Decrease	92,806,268	117,435,770

So that the free-trade policy of England which was to create an unlimited market for the wheat of the American farmer and advance its price has proved untrue. In seven years our exports of wheat from this country decreased over 92,000,000 bushels and the value of the exports fell off over \$117,000,000. In other words, the farmers of the United States received \$117,000,000 less for the wheat exported in 1886 than for the export of 1879. This was a loss of over 61 per cent. in the amount of wheat exported, and of over 70 per cent. in the value of the exports. The export value of a bushel of wheat in 1881 was over \$1.24 and in 1886 it was only 87 cents.

During this time there has been no export duty in this country or import duty in England on wheat. Absolute free trade has existed between these two countries so far as grain is concerned, and the resultant facts are apparent to every one.

This ought to show the American farmer that British free trade and Cobden Club laws have not and will not furnish him a foreign market or a high price for his products. What is the special cause of this falling off in the amount of exports and the depreciation in the export price of wheat? It is that England, by her policy towards her colonies, has imported her wheat from India instead of from America. England has expended almost hundreds of millions of money in building up the agricultural industries of her possessions in India. She has built thousands of miles of railroad and aided in the construction of hundreds of miles of irrigating canals, which has resulted in a very large increase in the production of wheat in India. The Indian ryots, as the small wheat farmers of India are called, who work for about 10 cents per day, are brought into competition with the labor of the American farmer to such an extent that they can produce wheat cheaper than the American farmer, notwithstanding the great advancement in agriculture and agricultural machinery in this country.

The following table, from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics for 1886, shows the amount of exports of wheat from India and the export price from 1879-'80 to 1885-'86, the same period covered by the table above showing the exports of American wheat:

Year.	Bushels.	Value.	Average price per bushel.
1879-'80	4,109,495	\$5,396,491	\$1.313
1880-'81	13,896,168	15,952,105	1.148
1881-'82	37,078,571	41,871,765	1.129
1882-'83	26,402,893	29,534,467	1.122
1883-'84	39,118,791	43,202,651	1.105
1884-'85	29,550,741	30,703,430	1.040
1885-'86	39,312,969	38,943,436	.991

From this it will be seen that while the exports of American wheat for seven years have fallen off from 153,000,000 bushels in 1879 to 57,000,000 in 1886, the exports of wheat from India have increased from 4,000,000 bushels in 1879 to over 39,000,000 bushels in 1886. The American exports of wheat have declined over 69 per cent. The India exports of wheat have increased over 900 per cent.

The American farmer can not rely in the future upon a market for his wheat in England. The continued decline of exports from this country and the continual increase of exports from India will drive the wheat of the American farmer entirely from the British islands during the next decade.

Mr. Sullivan, in the work referred to, has pointed out the great decline in English agricultural interests since the imports of wheat from India began under her free-trade policy. He has incontrovertibly shown that the agricultural interests of England are being destroyed by this policy, but the moneyed classes and the capitalists of the British Empire of England and of India are being benefited. The English free-trade policy is governed by the money princes and capitalists of the world. Their policy is to build up a foreign commerce and a foreign import trade, because from it they accumulate their millions. In conceiving and originating legislation they adopt and enforce a policy which they think will advance the interests and increase the accumulations of these classes. I believe that if the policy of England, which has been somewhat destructive of the agricultural interests of Ireland and of England, had not been compensated for, in the eyes of English statesmen and capitalists, by the trade and commerce created by the imports of wheat and other products from India, the tariff on American wheat would have been readopted in England years ago.

If the American farmer can not depend upon England as a foreign market for his wheat or produce when his home market is destroyed by the decline or overthrow of the manufacturing interests and the increase of agricultural products, where can he look? In what part of the world must he seek a market?

Mr. Chairman, comparatively a small amount of wheat has been imported into Germany and other continental nations. At different periods, when there was a foreign war, or a drought around the Baltic or upon the plains of Russia, there would be a demand for some American wheat, and America would supply the deficiency. During the last few years, since the export has so greatly diminished, some wheat has been exported to South Germany. What is the result? A short time since, to cut off this import of wheat from America, a new tariff was established on wheat in Germany. This new tariff is \$1.19 on 220 pounds, or about 30 per cent. ad valorem. The New York Nation, in commenting upon this action of Germany, says:

The object of it is to exclude American wheat from South Germany and to compel Bavaria, Baden, and the Rhine country to buy Prussian wheat exclusively. But it is much cheaper to supply the South German people with American wheat from London. Moreover, the South Germans are accustomed to American wheat; they even like it better than Prussian wheat. On the other hand, Prussian wheat is very conveniently situated for the English market, and very inconveniently for the South German market. Accordingly, a bill has been introduced in the Reichstag to enable North German merchants to ex-

port wheat to England and to import an equivalent amount of American wheat to South Germany free of duty. In order to make the swap easy and frictionless, it is proposed that the exporter of North German wheat shall have the right to sell his permits of importation just as he would sell a bill of exchange. The drollery of all this circumlocution, by which the consumer is sacrificed to the producer, has not penetrated the German mind to any great extent, but there is much suffering in South Germany in consequence of the deprivation of American supplies of food. Why do not some of our high-tariff men, who are such fast friends of the American farmer, propose a measure of retaliation?

What a prosperous time the American farmer will have when by such devices he is entirely shut out of foreign markets, and our Secretary of State, a member of the Cobden Club, is trying to enforce retaliatory measures in his behalf.

The Nation is a very high-toned free-trade organ, but it has here stated a few facts showing the extreme measures the German Government has resorted to to exclude American farmers from German markets. Germany has lately adopted custom-house regulations and tariffs, as I am informed by men who have been exporting meats and the products of animals, which practically prohibit the importation of American food-products into the German Empire. Still the President and his free-trade followers point out how the farmer is injured by American protection and how a free-trade policy in this country would be to his benefit.

We now import annually over \$60,000,000 worth of food supplies, and this bill proposes to add more of these agricultural products to the free-list. If the object is, as avowed, to protect the American farmer, why does not this bill provide for protecting the farmers' products against foreign competition? It is building up a home market by manufacturing and diversified interests that will advance the farmers' produce and add to the value of his real estate. In 1771 Dr. Franklin wrote from England, where he had been watching with his masterly mind the growth of her industries, and said:

Every manufactory encouraged in our country makes part of a market for provisions within ourselves and saves so much money to the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufactures he supplies. Here in England, it is well known and understood that whenever a manufactory is established which employs a number of hands it raises the value of land in the neighboring country all around. It seems, therefore, the interest of our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufacturers in preference to foreign ones.

The first and greatest statesmen of the Republic wrote to the same effect, that it was only by building up a home market that the American farmer could look for prosperity and wealth. Why is it not proposed by the bill to remove the tax from tobacco? Has not the farmer as much right to conduct a tobacco farm as a corn or wheat farm? Such inconsistencies in this Mills bill, the authorship of which remains in mystery, shows that its object is free trade, pure and simple. Disguise it as they may, this bill means free trade and unrestricted foreign competition.

This bill puts wool on the free-list. This is an unjust blow to one of the most important agricultural industries in this country. The President in one paragraph of his message pretends to sympathize with the farmer. In another he recommends taking the tariff off wool, because, he says, it is raw material. It is the finished product of the farm. Ask the farmer who has invested all his means in a sheep farm which is still encumbered by a mortgage if it is raw material to him. He has watched his flocks grow and increase by expending all his time and energy and that of his family in herding them in summer and feeding them in winter. During an unexpected hard winter he has run in debt to buy grain to save them from the severities of the storm.

The following extract and table show how the wool industry has been injured by the reduction of the tariff in 1883:

The wool-growers have especial reasons at this time to appeal to their brother farmers for support. At a time when their industry is depressed as it hardly ever has been before by foreign competition, permitted by a reduction of duties in 1883, by Treasury rulings since, and by systematic frauds in foreign ports, the President proposes in his annual message the repeal of all duties on wool. In the two years before the change of duty, and in the past two years, the imports for consumption were as follows:

Year.	Quantities.	Duties.	Year.	Quantities.	Duties.
1881.....	67,416,967	<i>Cents.</i> 7.20	1886.....	107,910,549	4.75
1882.....	63,016,769	6.11	1887.....	114,404,174	5.16
Average....	65,216,868	6.65	Average....	111,157,361	4.95

Under efficient protection the production of wool rose from 60,000,000 pounds in 1860 to 308,000,000 pounds in 1884, the year after the change of duty. It has since declined to 285,000,000 pounds in 1886, and according to estimates of the Agricultural Bureau to 265,000,000 pounds in 1887. Meanwhile the stocks of domestic wool unsold at the close of 1887 are greatly increased; 31,974,000 pounds are on hand, an increase of 6,620,157 pounds at Boston alone. To the mischief done by reduced duties there is added, first, the great fraudulent importation of Donskoi and other washed wool, under pretense that it is unwashed, a systematic fraud by which the United States consul at Odessa reports to the State Department that the Government has been defrauded for years out of more than \$15,000,000 in duties. Each pound of foreign wool thus fraudulently imported, already scoured and shrunken, takes the place of 2 to 4 pounds of American wool in natural condition.

The importations of wool have nearly doubled, while the American wool-growers have been going to bankruptcy to aid the Australian wool-farmers. The wool-growing industry, as is well known, can not exist

in the United States to any considerable extent in open, unrestricted competition with wool production in Australia, South America, and other countries. In 1883 the wool-clip of the United States was 320,000,000 pounds; in this year only about 260,000,000.

The agricultural interests must stand or fall together. The Australian and other foreign wool-growers are now brought into direct competition with the American wool-growers. The American wheat-farmer is brought into competition with the Indian ryot, who hires his labor for 10 ten cents per day. Many large wheat-farmers will be compelled in a few years to diversify their industry by keeping flocks of sheep to fertilize an impoverished soil. There are large tracts of land in the West and Rocky Mountain country fit only for raising sheep. Shall this great industry be destroyed or shall it be protected, so that America will grow all the wool required for American manufacture.

As has been so well said:

Price is one thing, ability or means with which to pay is quite different.

Diversified industry gives prosperity and means to purchase necessities for all. Low prices and cheap goods are only a mockery to those whose business has been so depressed by foreign competition they have no means to buy at any price.

Destroy the sheep industry of this country, turn 200,000 people out of employment and the million dependent on them for support; then the foreign wool-growers will put up the price, American manufacturers will have to buy their wool abroad, woolen goods will advance, and we shall have another practical illustration of free-trade theories.

WE SHOULD HAVE A NATIONAL REVENUE POLICY.

Mr. Chairman, I am for what Henry Clay called the American system. I am as much opposed to importing any revenue or tax system from England or other European countries as I am to importing their products of cheap pauperized labor. I am for a national as opposed to an international system of political economy. This is in accord with the progress of the times as well as with the distinct and peculiar condition of the material and political institutions of our country. Since Germany has adopted her national system of protection to her own industries and products, as against the former free-trade policy, she has built up her own industries as against England, in spite of all her difficulties. International free trade is not only impracticable, but it is impossible. There can be no such a thing as universal free trade except by reciprocity treaties between the commercial nations of the world. Every country in the world except England is now pursuing to some extent the policy of a national protective system.

The royal commission on the depression of British trade find as a fact that the protective policy which has been adopted to a great extent by the continental nations of Europe during the last ten years is one of the great causes of England's industrial decay.

During the last few years, whenever it is discovered by the statesmen of Germany, France, Austria, Russia, and other nations that the imports of any particular class of products by foreign competition are destroying the profit of their own industries, they immediately proceed to legislate or pass decrees which prohibit such foreign competition. Germany has within a short time practically excluded our wheat, our meats, and other provisions from her market. Prominent witnesses who testified before the royal commission said that the policy of other countries had become such that they saw no other way for even England to protect her industries except by a protective tariff against the importation of goods from the continental nations.

I have no time here to refer to the testimony or to the conclusions of the able commissioners upon this subject; but it can not be denied that the general tendency throughout the commercial world during the past two decades is to establish a national as distinguished from an international system. It is what the able German writer, Frederick List, calls the national as distinguished from the cosmopolitical economy. He says that—

The actual workings and results of a national protective policy as distinguished from the international free-trade policy are being adopted the world over.

Notwithstanding the dogmatic and theoretical assumptions, the free-trade system is necessarily built upon the basis of international reciprocity.

How can there be such a thing as free trade when nine-tenths of the nations of the world are adopting and enforcing a national protective policy? J. B. Say demands as a premise for the comprehension of his free-trade theories a universal republic and peace the world over. The political economy of Smith, Say, and others means cosmopolitical or world-wide economy. The theories of the advocates of free trade in America are built upon this international system; that is, they are built upon a myth. They ignore national boundary lines. It is not necessary to discuss whether universal free trade, by the abolition of protective tariffs and revenue laws the world over and the blotting out of all national boundary lines, so far as trade and commerce are concerned, would be beneficial to the human race. Such a thing is impossible. If a free-trade policy were adopted by us, and by the importation of cheap raw material and cheap laborers from China and Europe the price of labor greatly reduced, and goods were manufactured so

cheap that we could compete in the foreign markets, the protective tariffs of other countries would prevent their exportation from this country, but could not prevent the flooding of this country with the cheap goods of foreign nations and the closing of American factories.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

Mr. Chairman, I would, as a part of this system of American political economy, reach out after a foreign market and build up a foreign trade where practicable. We ought to be able to build up a large South American trade. If the proper policy was pursued we could soon export large quantities of manufactured goods to our South American neighbors. They are our natural commercial allies. If we should pursue the policy of England and Germany towards these South American countries, we could in time take from them a large portion of the trade. They built up this trade by paying large subsidies to the lines of ships that created it. Here is the one opportunity we have where it is practicable to build up a foreign market, and the Democratic free-traders prevent it. The Republicans have many times attempted to subsidize steam-ship lines between America and South American ports to build up this trade, and such subsidies have been as many times defeated by the free-trade Democrats. They have even refused to vote liberal pay for carrying the mails to incidentally aid in building up this American commerce.

Mr. Chairman, our political institutions, the future material welfare of our country, the freedom and equality of our citizens all demand the permanent establishment of a national system of political economy entirely free and independent from the commercial and industrial as well as from the political institutions and policies of other nations. I would make the protection of American labor from foreign competition the keystone in the arch of this American industrial system; I would extend theegis of that national protective system to all the industries and productions of our broad land; I would protect from foreign competition the cotton, rice, fruits, sugar, oranges, peanuts, and bananas of the Southern planter, as well as the corn, wheat, meats, and other provisions of the Northern farmer; I would protect the almond, the olive, the grape, and raisin culture of California, as well as the lumber and other interests on the Northern boundary; I would protect the great lead, iron, coke, and coal-mining interests of the South, of the Rocky Mountains, and of the Middle States; I would protect the great manufacturing interests everywhere, South as well as North, East as well as West; I would proclaim to the world that we propose to protect our home markets and our home labor from the competition of cheap foreign goods and pauperized labor everywhere. And, sir, I would henceforth protect our laboring men and their families from the importation and immigration of contract and pauperized laborers as well as from the importation of the products of their work. I believe the time will come when this will be imperatively necessary. As President Garfield said:

It is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor. Let Americans devote themselves to the welfare of America.

Mr. Huskisson, in the England Parliament, said:

To enable capital to obtain a fair remuneration labor must be kept down.

We say, to enable labor to obtain fair remuneration wages must be kept up.

Lord Brougham said in Parliament:

England can afford to incur some loss on the exports of English goods for the purpose of destroying foreign manufactures in their cradle.

The protective policy has prevented the destruction of our manufactures against the wish of American statesmen. The law prohibiting the importation of Chinese labor has assisted in preventing the degradation and poverty of the American workingmen. Many quotations could be made to show the irreconcilable differences between the English and the American policy. The English capitalist and statesman indorses and approves the President's message and his free-trade policy. Others during this discussion have cited from the comments of the English press and statesmen in favor of that un-American document. The intelligent American laborers of this country are protesting against it and the industrial policy it advocates. These American workmen will put their protests into practical form next November, when they will deposit their ballots "as silent as snow-flakes in the valley at midnight." But they will establish the permanent policy of national protection, and they will remove from positions of power and influence the free-traders and the authors and advocates of free-trade bills.

The American nation is devoted to industry. Its origin and history have been industrial and not warlike. Its conquests and advancement have been made through the arts, sciences, and industries. The American armies are armies of workingmen. On their banners are not written the names of cities sacked, "countries pillaged to enrich our own," but the names of inventors, civilizing influences, labor-saving machinery, and the independence, education, and elevation of the laboring man.

Mr. Chairman, the blindest policy of all is the attempt to array the West and South against protection. The West and South need a protective tariff more than the East. The New England States, even with the vacillating protection they received before 1861, built up a manufacturing and diversified industry and accumulated wealth that

gave them a commanding position over the Middle, Western, and Southern States. When the high tariff of 1861-'62 was enacted the manufacturing industries crossed the Alleghany Mountains and spread over the great Middle and adjoining Western States. It diversified their industries and built up their manufactures until they exceeded those of New England. Commerce and the wholesale trade followed the manufactures until the great cities of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys and the Lakes far exceeded those of New England in wealth and commerce.

Next came the efforts of the Democratic party in the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and now in the Fiftieth Congresses, to break down the protective system. The persistent and able opposition of the Republican party, aided by a few Democrats, defeated the passage of the free-trade bills in the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-eighth, and Forty-ninth Congresses. This defeat caused the manufacturing industries to advance across the plains and mountains of the far West, and to penetrate and invade the Southern States. The result is we see the iron and steel and lead mining and manufacturing industries of Colorado, Alabama, and Tennessee. We behold the trade and commerce and manufactures of Kansas City, Omaha, Denver, Pueblo, Atlanta, Birmingham, and other cities fast growing ahead of their rivals in the Eastern and Middle States. I speak of the South in connection with the West because their interests in this industrial advance are identical. The Eastern and Middle States with their enormous capital and accumulated wealth can do much better without protection than we of the West and South.

Westward [and southward] the course of empire takes its way;

The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
Time's noblest offspring is the last.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the last and noblest drama of industrial offspring will be that of the West and South. And when this free-trade bill shall be defeated, and the people put their seal of condemnation upon it next November, then will begin an era of manufacturing and commercial growth in the South and West before unheard of. One of the ablest of European writers on economies and protection relates the fact that Washington, on the day of his inauguration, wore a suit of home-manufactured cloth, in order, in the simple and impressive manner so peculiar to this great man, to give all his successors in office and to all future legislators a memorable way in which the welfare of this country is to be promoted.

How this lesson has been lost upon President Cleveland and the Democratic party.

Mr. Chairman, I caution any gentlemen or any political party not to attempt to overthrow the American protective system. He who supposes that system had its origin or continuance in legislative statutes is ignorant of its history or does not grasp its import. It is the result of a growth. It is the crystallized sentiment and opinion of the American people. It has been evolved from the necessities and conflicts of our industrial system as much as our national unity has been evolved from the necessities and conflicts of our political system.

Mr. FUNSTON. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the tariff question has already been long drawn out, the mine has been thoroughly worked, and there is but little that can be added on either side of the question without repeating what has already been brought to the attention of this House. Were I an attorney in the case I would certainly be willing to rest the cause of protection on the evidence already adduced. This, however, is a case in which not only the cause at issue is being tried, but the litigants themselves are expected to go on the stand and give the reason for the faith that is within them. This is my only apology for my appearance at this time. I am for American interests as against the balance of the world.

If any provide not for his own * * * he is worse than an infidel.

However much my heart may go out for the unfortunates in the Old World, my first duty is to my own countrymen. Therefore, I am a protectionist in the full sense of the word. I would protect our country against foreign invasion, whether it be armed troops to lay waste our happy land or the manufactured products of half-paid labor to cripple our industries and destroy the occupation of our laboring people. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to-day to plead for the protection of any special class or interest as against any others that are equally worthy. The policy of the friends of protection should be to build up and maintain a system which reaches out and includes every man, whether rich or poor, whether living on the plains of the West or among the hills of New England; whether on the lakes of the North or the orange groves of the South; a system which builds up and sacredly protects every honest industry in which an American citizen secures employment or invests a dollar; a system which benefits not only those who are directly engaged in the protected industry, but all others who have the good fortune to be American citizens.

A tariff bill based on any other principle is one-sided and disproportionate, and ought to be honestly adjusted, or otherwise permitted to perish in its own narrowness and selfishness. Protected coal for Virginia and free wool for Ohio is not a protective system. Protected sugar for Louisiana and free salt for Michigan is not a protective system. Protected rice for South Carolina and free lumber for Oregon is not a protective system. Protected wheat for Minnesota and free fruit

for California is not a protective system. Such a scheme is little-souled, narrow-minded, partisan and sectional, and unworthy of a place among the plans of statesmen. Such is, indeed, the character of the bill which we are called upon to consider at this time. It bears the ear-marks of the politician in its partiality to those States the Democratic party hopes to carry at the next Presidential election. It exhibits the accustomed contempt of the Democracy for the interests of the agriculturist and the mechanic by placing many of the productions of their toil on the free-list, while, by reducing the duty on many articles only just enough to increase their importation and keep up the revenue, it blunders as to its method of reducing the surplus.

Whatever may have been the design of its framers, the sure result can only be the destruction of many of our industries in which thousands of laborers find honest employment and great amounts of capital a legitimate investment. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL], whom I do not see in his seat, well says in his speech of the 29th of April.

We are going in the same track that our predecessors followed in 1857 and 1871.

The gentleman doubtless spoke more wisely than he knew. I agree with him fully, and to assist him in proving his case I will read an extract from President Buchanan's message to Congress dated December 8, 1857, in which he says:

We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet notwithstanding all these advantages our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and in all the elements of natural wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

The able gentleman from Massachusetts speaks for his party when he says "we," and he utters the fact, whether he knows it or not. There can be no doubt of the intentions of the Democratic party to return to their old beat of 1857. The same sad prospects, the same outlook of social misfortune and industrial desolation await the unfurling again of their free-trade banner. It brings to us a vision of the past—the silent wheels, the smokeless stacks, the deserted workshops, the widespread want of 1857. [Applause.] These calamities seem to have a charm for the average Democrat equalled only by the charm of wild-cat banks, half-paid labor, and cheap foreign goods. As to the question of labor in these halcyon days of Democracy, I speak from personal knowledge when I say that the strongest and best of laborers were hired on the farm in those days at \$125 to \$150 per year, and boarded themselves, and the same class of hands are to-day receiving from \$250 to \$300 per year.

What is true of farm laborers, as relates to increase of wages, is true also in all other branches of industry. No man who has the least knowledge of the fact will deny that the laborer of to-day is paid an increase of from 40 to 65 per cent., according to occupation, over what he was paid in 1857 to 1860. I desire here to submit a table, which is the result of careful study and investigation by the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, showing the per cent. of advance of wages of employes since the period before the civil war to the present time: Railroads, 35 per cent.; cotton, 50 per cent.; woolen, 65 per cent.; paper, 55 per cent.; buttons, 55 per cent.; cigars, 50 per cent.; whips, 44 per cent.; domestics, 65 per cent.; iron, 64 per cent.; wool, 64 per cent.; day labor, 40 per cent.; average of the whole, 52 per cent. But the eloquent and able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] would tell us, as he did in his address to this House on the 26th of last month:

That labor is as much a commodity selling in the market as the materials to be worked up. If the demand is great wages will go up; if the demand is small wages will go down.

Does the gentleman stop to reflect that it is protection which creates the demand for the labor?

No one, even of the most radical free-trade convictions, has asserted on this floor that protection does not build up and sustain manufactures and other industries which demand the labor of many thousands of men. It is the creator of demand for labor, and therefore the creator of wages, high or low, as the tariff itself is high or low. No one who admits that demand regulates wages and that a tariff creates the demand can arrive at any other conclusion. There is but one side, then, of this question for the laboring man, and that is the side that gives him the wages. That free trade or a duty for revenue only will create a demand for labor no one upon this floor has had the temerity to assert. That point has been studiously avoided by all who have maintained the free-trade side of this question. It is the missing link in their chain of argument.

What is to become of the laboring man when the demand for his services is superseded by foreign labor expended upon imported goods is a question of graver importance than that of a few cents on a bolt of cloth or a barrel of salt. The labor question has become a most important factor in our system of government and no innovation should be made which in any way affects this question without carefully ascertaining beyond a peradventure that the change will be in accord with the labor interests of the country. Yet it is proposed by this bill now under consideration to remove the protective duties in whole from many important industries in which thousands of our countrymen are employed, and to materially reduce protection on others, the inevitable result of which will be the destruction of those industries

and shutting out of employment thousands of men who are now earning a comfortable living. As a reimbursement for all this loss and industrial disturbance they are told that a limited number of manufactured articles which they may desire to buy can be purchased a few cents cheaper in consequence of the adoption of free-trade principles.

Do gentlemen ever reflect that the question of cheapness is not the all-important question with the laboring man? The question of employment at good wages is of far greater importance to him. None are less inclined to higgler over prices than he. None are more willing to live and let live than he. Something to buy with is what concerns him most. Goods may be cheap, they may be offered at half price, but what advantage is that to the man who is out of employment and out of money? The fact that goods are cheap only adds to his aggravation. No gentleman on the free-trade side of this question, who has referred to the protection on farm products, has failed to assert that the duty on them does not add to their market value, except in the single case of wool. If this be true, then the laboring man can expect no reduction in the prices of articles that go upon his table. If this be true, beef and pork and bread and butter and all other articles of like kind, which make up the most expensive part of his purchases, will remain the same as to-day, while, if the most that is claimed for free trade be true, he may expect to obtain his wearing apparel a few dollars cheaper per year than under protection.

But this can not apply to cotton goods, for they are already cheaper in this country than in any other part of the world. In any event, the proposed reduction must be confined to woolen goods. Now, if it be true that free wool is the panacea which shall cure all his ills, the sovereign and only remedy provided for his relief, let us see how great that relief will be. The present duty on wool is about 10 cents. In a suit of woolen goods there are from 3 to 7 pounds of wool. If all be true that the free-traders say, the suit costs about 50 cents more than it should under free trade. Allowing two full suits each year, \$1 would be saved to the laboring man by free wool. And to save this \$1 he is asked to join in a crusade against the manufacturing interests of the country, by which his wages will be reduced at least one hundred times that amount, and most likely he will be thrown out of employment altogether.

It has been uniformly urged on the other side of this House that the manufacturer absorbs all the benefits of protection and that he does not permit them to extend to the laborer. Might we not right here urge with equal force that in case the duty is removed from wool the manufacturer will absorb all the benefits and that he will not permit them to extend to the purchaser, so that after all the \$1 to be saved may prove to be only a myth? While I do not want to be understood as saying that free wool alone would bring about this reduction in wages, I do want to be understood that whenever you strike down one of the great protected industries of this country all others must go with it.

The American system of protection is one wherein every industry is interrelated with and interdependent upon every other. Each industry stands as a pillar in a structure. Let some free-trade Samson pull down one of these pillars and the whole temple of American industry must fall. When this American system is destroyed labor in Europe and in this country must stand on the same level as to wages.

In this connection I submit a few tables taken from a most valuable book, entitled "Wages, Living, and Tariff," by E. A. Hartshorn, to show what that labor level will be. The current wages paid in flax and hemp spinning mills in Great Britain and in this country are:

	New York.	England.
	<i>Per day.</i>	<i>Per day.</i>
Spinners, women.....	\$1.00	\$0.30
Twisters, women.....	.85	.28
Rovers, women.....	.75	.28
Spreaders, women.....	1.00	.30
Card feeders, women.....	.85	.30
Overseers, men.....	3.00	1.40
Hacklers, men.....	2.00	.85
Children.....	.40	.08

	Newark.	Paisley.
	<i>Per week.</i>	<i>Per week.</i>
Cop-winders.....	\$8.00	\$3.50
Finishers.....	5.50	2.50
Reelers.....	8.00	4.25
Spoolers.....	8.00	3.25
Foremen.....	20.00	7.00
Pickers.....	7.00	4.12
Hank-winders.....	7.00	3.75

	New York.	Scotland.
	<i>Per week.</i>	<i>Per week.</i>
Wool-sorters:		
Overseer.....	\$18.00	\$7.50
Men.....	12.00	5.50
Dyers, men.....	7.00	3.75
Carding:		
Overseer.....	20.00	16.50
Card-tenders, girls.....	4.00	2.00
Spinning:		
Overseer.....	18.00	7.50
Men.....	12.00
Boys.....	4.00	1.50

	New York.	Scotland.
Warping:		
Overseer.....	Per week. \$18.00	Per week. \$7.50
Dresser-tenders:		
Men.....	10.50	
Women.....	3.50	
Children.....	3.50 to 4.00	1.50
Weaving:		
Overseer.....	30.00	16.50
Section hands.....	13.50	7.50
Weavers.....	10.00	3.75
Finishing:		
Overseer.....	35.00	15.00
Shearers.....	7.50	3.75
Pressmen.....	8.00	3.75
Giggers and fullers.....	7.50	3.75

	New York.	Bolton.
	Per week.	Per week.
Card-grinders, men.....	\$8.23	\$5.59
Card-strippers, men.....	7.86	5.59
Slubber-tenders, girls.....	6.00	4.36
Mule-spinners, men.....	10.50	5.95
Frame-spinners, girls.....	4.50	2.31
Wrappers, girls.....	6.00	4.22
Weavers, men, per loom.....		1.30
Weavers, girls, per loom, \$3 or.....	9.00	
Loom jockers, men.....	12.25	9.00
Mule overlookers, men.....	18.00	10.22
Mechanics, average.....	13.00	7.54
Engine drivers.....	18.00	10.22
Firemen, average.....	8.40	5.00

Comparative rates of weekly wages paid in Europe and in the United States in 1878.

[Condensed from the Report of the Secretary of State on the State of Labor in Europe, derived from facts reported by the United States consuls, Washington, 1879.]

Occupations.	Great Britain.						United States.	
	Belgium.	Denmark.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	Great Britain.	New York.	Chicago.
Bakers.....	\$4.40	\$4.25	\$5.55	\$3.50	\$3.90	\$6.50-\$6.60	\$5-\$9	\$8.00-\$12.00
Blacksmiths.....	4.40	3.90	5.45	3.55	3.94	7.04-8.12	10-14	9.00-12.00
Bookbinders.....		3.72	4.85	3.82	3.90	6.50-7.83	12-18	9.00-20.00
Bricklayers.....	6.00		4.00	3.60	3.45	7.58-9.03	12-15	6.00-10.50
Cabinet-makers.....	4.80		6.00	3.97	4.95	7.70-8.48	9-13	7.00-15.00
Carpenters and joiners.....	5.40	4.25	5.42	4.00	4.18	7.33-8.25	9-12	7.50-12.00
Farm laborers.....			3.15	2.87	3.50	3.40-4.25		
Laborers, porters, etc.....	3.00			2.92	2.60	4.50-5.00	6-9	5.50-9.00
Painters.....	4.20	4.15	4.90	3.92	4.60	7.25-8.16	10-16	6.00-12.00
Plasterers.....	5.40			3.80	4.55	7.63-10.13	10-15	9.00-15.00
Plumbers.....	6.00		5.50	3.60	3.90	7.13-8.46	12-18	12.00-20.00
Printers.....	4.62	4.70	4.80	3.90	3.90	7.52-7.75	8-18	12.00-18.00
Shoemakers.....	3.30	4.75	3.12	4.52	4.52	7.35	12-18	9.00-18.00
Tailors.....	4.10	5.10	3.58	4.30	4.30	5.00-7.30	10-18	6.00-18.00
Tinsmiths.....	4.80	3.90	4.40	3.65	3.60	6.00-7.30	10-14	9.00-12.00

Mr. Chairman, I hardly need follow this branch of my subject further, only than to anticipate the charge which may be made that in the last table the industries mentioned are but little, if any, influenced by the tariff. That is true so far as relates to a direct influence, but the indirect influence of the protective system is in many instances greater than the direct. As an illustration: A woolen mill is started and a thousand men employed at good wages. Their benefit is direct, because that industry is protected. But the butcher who feeds them finds a ready market at good prices, and he too is benefited, though his business is not enumerated on the tariff schedule. So, also, with the carpenter who erects the building, the workmen who dig the foundation, the artist who does the painting, the blacksmith who repairs the tools, as also the baker, the grocer, the hotel-keeper, and hundreds of other avocations not mentioned in the tariff list. These all receive an impetus because of the men employed, and their benefits are indirect. Nor do the benefits of that woolen mill just mentioned stop with those who are benefited secondarily. It continues to others who move up and take the places of those employed, and so on until many thousands are favorably affected.

When three hundred thousand mills and manufactories of all kinds, as there are to-day all over this great country, are put in motion, the effect is felt in the most distant parts and becomes the nourishing life-blood of the whole people. Nor are the benefits confined to those who perform manual labor. The school-teacher is better paid, because so many find employment in other business than his. The doctor finds a wider scope for his practice, because so many have chosen callings other than his. The lawyer and the preacher the same; and all are better paid, because so many others have something to do and something to pay with.

Mr. Chairman, after all we have heard from the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber about the deplorable condition of our people under what they have chosen to call a robber-tax, we instinctively

turn to them and survey their condition. We find a greater number of the laboring people owners of their own homes than in any other country upon the face of the earth. They wear better clothes and are supplied better at their tables, and are better educated and paid than the laboring people of any other country. We can not exaggerate by saying that the American laborer has the comforts of life as well as many of the luxuries in larger quantities than any other working people. When their families are encountered in the churches or in the schools or in any of the walks of life no one can determine by their appearance to what class they belong—whether poor or rich. They do not look like a people who were robbed. They themselves know to the contrary, as their votes in the industrial States have always testified. And when we behold the nation's progress in wealth and all the elements of civilization during the last twenty-five years we are indeed lost in amazement.

I shall not attempt to repeat the facts here; suffice to say that even within the last eighteen years it has been more than double that of any other nation in the world. And all this has been done notwithstanding the so-called robber-tariff tax of which we hear so much. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, says it has been done in spite of the tariff. Does any man, even the gentleman from Texas himself, believe it? Does any man believe that without protection the mining interests of iron ore would have increased 110 per cent. since 1870, coal 66 per cent., and many other industries in like proportion? Does any man believe that under free trade any judicious business man would have put a dollar into manufacturing enterprises in this country while he could have carried on such industry in England at a labor cost of 25 per cent. to 100 per cent. less than here? The cost of ocean transportation can not be offered as an obstacle in the way of English competition. If I have been correctly informed, the rocks that pave the streets of New Orleans were brought from England as ship-ballast in ships used in the cotton trade.

I have no doubt that the English manufacturers would gladly lay down their goods in our country free of the cost of transportation. They could well afford to do it, for the monopoly of the American market would amply reimburse them. Every American citizen should spurn it. I for one do not want it. I would rather see the skies of Tennessee and Pennsylvania darkened with the smoke of their furnaces; I would rather hear the clatter of their machinery and behold their industrial classes employed at good wages than to have English goods thrown upon our shores at any price, however cheap. And now, Mr. Chairman, as to the farmer, who seems to be made the burden of complaint by the gentlemen on the other side. Why all these tears for the farmer? Why this lamentation, while at the same time you persist in removing the duty on foreign wool? Wool is the only farm product which you admit to be enhanced in value by the tariff. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that the farmers are asking none of your sympathy. They know your hands are against them, and the only favor they ask of you is not to insult their intelligence with the specious assumption that they are so ignorant as to believe in your theories or trust to the promises which you hold out to them with one hand while you tear down their industry with the other. Put up the duty on wool instead of taking off what it now has, and you will give them some reason to believe in your wisdom and sincerity. The farmer is not dead to his interests. He knows better perhaps where they lie than the men who are assuming to champion his cause. But little if any complaint comes from him of the high prices alleged to have arisen by reason of the tariff.

Of all the petitions which have reached my table in the last four years, not one has come from a farmer asking for the reduction of the tariff on wool or on any other article. He knows there is not an article of clothing or machinery or tools for the farm that is not cheaper to-day than it was in the free-trade days of 1860. He knows, too, that there has been a gradual and continuous cheapening of goods and manufactured articles of all kinds from 1860 down to the present time. He knows that the lives of our fathers and mothers, which were so full of toil at the loom, the spinning-wheel, and other tedious, dreary forms of labor, have, through the fostering care of our protective system, been rendered comparatively happy and easy, so that where once was heard the monotonous clinking of the shuttle are now heard the sweet tones of the organ and the piano. Books and newspapers have taken the place of knitting-needles and spinning-wheels. The farmers of the country have taken their places upon a higher and better plane of culture, from which they do not propose to be lured by the siren notes of the free-trader.

We hear but little complaint from them of high prices of things which they have to buy.

A first-class double-spring-seated farm wagon finished, in better style than were the carriages of our fathers fifty years ago now sells at \$65 retail; Fitchburg cassimere, 85 cents per yard; cashmerets, 35 to 38 cents a yard; best standard sheeting, 8 cents per yard; good calicoes, 4½ to 6½ cents per yard; nails, 3 cents per pound, and all others of the real necessities of farm life at the same low rates. Thanks, gentlemen, restrain your sympathy; bestow it where it will be more appropriate and better appreciated. What the farmer most desires is a good market. What he has to buy is not a question so serious with him as what he

has to sell. If you will only give him a good market in which to sell his products, make his market as easy of access and as convenient as are his places of purchase, he will ask no odds in the battle of life. This is fast becoming the case now under the benign influences of the American system of protection. The great cities of Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City are fast becoming the leading markets of the world.

The great State of Illinois is one vast work-shop. Missouri, with her rich mines of iron, coal, and zinc, is only held back by the mirage of free trade. Kansas is rapidly following with her smelting furnaces, glass factories, foundries, and machine-shops. The farmer of the West welcomes them as the best friends of his interests. In them he sees a market which is far preferable to that of London, 4,000 miles away. Engaged in these industries he sees thousands of consumers employed who are his customers, and who, if not so employed, would be his competitors in agricultural pursuits, thus doubling the productions of the farm, which must necessarily result in an over-supply of the home market of all such commodities as the farmer produces. Thus his home market is destroyed, his production doubled, and he driven to markets beyond the sea, where with a vast surplus he must come into competition with the cheapest labor of the world. Gentlemen tell us that the London market governs the price of our farm products. London can fix the prices of our products only so long as she pays more than is paid in America.

The American market has to gain but 4 per cent. on the farm productions of the country to make the home demand equal to the home supply, and then not London but our own home demand will control the prices of all home products. The farmers of this country want to hasten that time. Every interest impels them to it. Every patriotic impulse urges it upon them. They want neither English markets nor English goods, and will hail with delight the day when we shall have only American markets and American goods. [Applause.] I for one am ready to put up the fences around the outside and nail up the gates. Gentlemen have talked upon this floor about giving the farmers the world's market as if our protective tariff had shut them out from the markets of the world. Such talk is absolutely silly. We have no export duty. The products of this country can leave our shores without the least obstruction. The markets of the world are before them, such as they can get into.

But we find an economic system much like our own surrounding every country in Europe except England, and even she is not absolutely free, for she collects \$100,000,000 annually. Were we to adopt absolute free trade not a single market of the world would be freer to us than it is to-day. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], in his remarks on this floor on the 26th of April, declared that our tariff rendered manufactured products so expensive that we cannot sell them at competitive prices in foreign markets. Is the gentleman aware that many of our most valuable products, such as steel, etc., are taken in the raw state from the mines and that nothing but labor is employed to convert them into manufactured products, and the fact that the articles when manufactured have protection does not prevent them being sold in foreign or home markets just the same as if unprotected?

To be more explicit, if a home manufacturer have a crate of pottery worth \$90, and there is a duty of \$10 a crate on pottery, which added to the \$90 would make the selling price \$100, that would not prevent the home manufacturer selling his crate in a foreign market at its actual value, which is \$90, if he chose to do so. The gentleman's argument is in a great measure fallacious, for it can not apply to those products into which nothing but labor enters, nor can it apply to goods manufactured from cotton or other materials of which we are exporters, as the duty on such materials does not affect the price. Mr. Chairman, England is the only nation in Europe that makes any pretense to free trade. Does any one believe she adopted that policy through any feeling of brotherhood for the balance of the world? Does any one believe that she did so through any feeling of brotherly love for America? To say so would be to stultify the history of that people in their relations to this country.

For eight hundred years England maintained the most inflexible barriers of protection; and not protection only, but in many articles their exclusive policy amounted to prohibition, preventing entirely the importation of such things as came in competition with her own industries. Even while the American colonies were dependencies of Great Britain she prohibited the exportation of American sugar except in English vessels, which were compelled to discharge their cargoes in English ports; and so jealous was she of her own colonies that she made it a capital offense to transport sheep from England to America, in order that she might keep down the American wool industry.

Skilled mechanics were prohibited under penalty of death from emigrating to America. The shipment to America of looms and other machinery for manufacturing the various textiles was prohibited under heavy penalties. Lord Chatham declared at one time that the Americans ought not to be permitted to manufacture even so much as a boot nail; and the English Parliament, that great body to which Englishmen delight to point, came within three votes of passing a bill by which every American industry was to be laid waste by English soldiery, and all this while the American colonies were still British possessions. Does

any man believe that a nation guilty of these flagrant outrages against her own colonies would have her conscience aroused with sentiments of benevolence and philanthropy after those colonies had become an independent power and had stricken off the galling restrictions and prohibitions of the mother country? Are gentlemen so stupid as to suppose that England has changed her policy as a measure of brotherly love for us?

England does nothing for love; she does all things for money or other substantial gain. When she had finally converted her whole island into a workshop; when she had become an industrial giant, capable of competing with the balance of the world; when she discovered that she must import food products valued at \$800,000,000, and raw material for manufacture to the amount of \$650,000,000; when she became aware that she needed a market abroad of \$1,200,000,000 annually for her manufactured products; when she knew that to ship manufactured products to England would be like "carrying coals to Newcastle," then it was, and then only, Mr. Chairman, that she found it to her interest to abolish her protective system and ask the balance of the world to do likewise. England accumulated her wealth and strength under a protective tariff régime. Free trade as yet is not her settled policy. It is but an experiment, and it is one, too, against which many of her wisest statesmen are opposed. Sir Edward Sullivan a few years ago said:

Thirty years ago England had almost a monopoly of the manufacturing industries of the world; she produced everything in excess of her consumption, other nations comparatively nothing. The world was obliged to buy from her because it could not buy anywhere else. The discoveries of gold and steam immensely increased the demands and the purchasing power of the world, and consequently the demand for the products of England. Her wealth increased by leaps and bounds that were bewildering; she was intoxicated with success; with her immense accumulated wealth, her machinery, her coal, her iron, her insular position, she thought herself unassailable; she laughed at the possibility of foreign competition; she offered to fight the rest of the world with her right hand tied behind her back. She said to the world, "I will receive anything you can send me without duty," adding at the same time an expression of hope that they would in turn receive her goods. But they said, "No; we gladly avail ourselves of your kind offer of admitting our goods; certainly we will send you all we possibly can. At present, unfortunately, we have nothing to send; we can not yet supply our own wants, but when we have more capital and your machinery and workmen, we hope to have a large surplus to send you." Well, that was thirty years ago. Now, France and America and Belgium have got our machinery and our workmen and ample capital, and they are sending us a yearly increasing surplus that is driving our own goods out of our own market, and every year they are more completely closing their markets to our goods.

The language of Lord Sullivan is the language of thousands of other Englishmen who believe that England's interests require the re-adoption of a judicious protective policy in order to maintain the industrial supremacy which she has achieved.

And now, Mr. Chairman, about the so-called robber tax on the poor man's blankets. If there is one thing in this discussion which has received more attention than another by the Democrats of this House it is the tariff on blankets. They have abused it more than the tariff on any twenty other articles on the schedule. The opprobrious epithets of the English language have been exhausted in denunciation of that tariff. One would suppose to hear this tirade that a Democrat regards such tariff as surpassed in enormity only by outright murder. But when we turn to the bill under consideration, which comes from the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and which they ask us to vote for, we find they have placed a tariff of 40 per cent. on blankets. If the tariff on blankets is robbery, why this robber tax of 40 per cent.? Why does this Democratic committee put but 50 cents on a gallon of wine and \$1 on a \$2.50 blanket?

This shows the insincerity of their pretensions. It shows either that they do not believe what they say, or believing they themselves are the willing robbers. Why did they not take all the duty off blankets and put it on whisky and tobacco, if they are sincere in their assertion that those articles should bear the burden of taxation?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard so much about tariff taxation upon the people one would almost suppose that all our State and school and road taxes were the result of the tariff, while the fact is, there is not one penny levied upon any man or his property by the tariff outside of the importer of foreign goods. You may say the results are the same as a tax on the people, but it is not a tax on the people; and we think we are prepared to show that neither the results nor principles involved are the same as a tax. No one, I presume, disputes the right of the Government to levy a duty upon imported goods for purposes of revenue, for the protection of American manufactures, for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations. The first and second divisions of these propositions are sanctioned by the plain language of the Constitution and by acts of Congress passed during its first session, while nearly all were yet living who had been members of the constitutional convention that framed our present national compact, while many of these makers of the Constitution were also members of Congress, and, too, while Washington, who had been president of the constitutional convention, was also President of the United States.

Surely in this presence the institution of the protective system which has been fortified by legislative enactment from the inception of our Government down to the present time, can not fail to be in accordance with the very genius and spirit of the American institutions.

In connection with the third division of this proposition it is important to note a valuable item of history, cited by Hon. John A. Kasson in a recent article in the *Forum*, according to which, in the year 1766, Benjamin Franklin, when before a committee of the English Parliament, said:

I never heard any objection made in America to the right of Parliament to levy duties to regulate commerce.

Again:

The payment of duties to regulate commerce was never disputed.

These early constitutional and legislative predilections show that the principle was fundamental in our organic compact, and that the origin and development of the foreign-commerce clause of the Constitution were perfectly normal and necessary. I may say, however, that the right under the Constitution to levy duties is not now and here a disputed question.

This right is reinforced by a principle which obtains in many of the States and nearly every incorporated city. The corporate authorities of the city say to all outsiders, "We have built the city at great expense; these streets have been paved at the expense of our people; these magnificent halls and parks are the fruits of the taxation of our persons and property; everything you see comes from our toil; our merchants and citizens have borne their share of all this expense; thousands of people are located here; it is unsurpassed as a market; but before you can drive in your wagon loaded with the same kinds of goods that are produced by our artisans or sold by our merchants, and before you can be permitted to run up a red flag in front of their doors you must pay money into the treasury of this city for the acquisition of privileges which we only have secured at great sacrifice, labor, and expense."

Mr. Chairman, this is protection for the city and for the citizens of the city, and for the arts and artisans of the city. No one questions this right; no one regards it as a tax on the people of that city. The Republican party of America stands precisely in the relation of the city and its citizens to the outside world. It says to Europe and to all cheap-labor countries, "We have here the best market in the world. It was established through the toils and hardships of our fathers. It has been built up and is now maintained by the magnificent pluck and energy of our people. We make more money and spend it faster than any other nation of equal magnitude on the face of the earth. But before you, who have no interest whatever in our country; you, whose hands are rather against us than for us, before you can be permitted to run in your cheap foreign goods and compete with our own citizens, you must pay money into the Treasury of the United States." This, Mr. Chairman, is protection to our citizens and to our industries. Do you call that a tax on the people?

But you say "The amount paid for the admission of the goods is added to the price of the goods, and that the consumer pays it, and this is a tax."

I know a certain county wherein the farmers believed they were paying too much for goods. They organized a co-operative association, rented a house, hired a foreman and clerk, and obtained their goods at a price a large per cent. below what they had been paying for them. Dare any one say that because the hire of the foreman and clerk and the rent of the house were computed in fixing the selling prices of the goods those items were a tax on the stockholders? Any business man would say that those items were a part of the expense in a business transaction for saving or making money. In 1861 the people of this country, through the National Government, entered into a business arrangement wherein they proposed to lay duties on all foreign goods which came into competition with our own productions.

Under that system such goods have gradually grown cheaper, year by year, until an average reduction in prices of 28 per cent. has been reached. Our own manufacturing enterprises have been stimulated and developed, a higher degree of skill has been attained in every department, and as a result of this American system we have this magnificent reduction in the prices of our own home manufactures. Dare any man call that a tax? It would be the sheerest nonsense, and I have no better name than twaddle for such tirade. It falls beneath the dignity of argument. We are told, however, that the reduction in the prices of goods is due to the invention of machinery. Do gentlemen stop to reflect that the progress of invention is the result of a desire to cheapen production rather than to secure a patent? The protective tariff is as great a stimulant to the inventor as it is to the manufacturer.

Will any man assert that the recent discoveries and inventions for the manufacture of sugar from sorghum would have been made had there been no protection on sugar? I know something of the gentleman to whose efforts we are indebted in a great measure for the development of the sorghum-sugar industry. I know that he spent a fine fortune of his own and risked all that he could get from others, and as a last resort came to Congress and through the committee of which I am a member got further assistance. Will any one tell me that that man would have done and risked all I have mentioned had sugar not been on the protected list? It was because it was there and because he had faith in his countrymen that it should remain there; in other words,

because he believed that there was a fortune for him in the manufacture of sugar, that this work has been accomplished. Thus it will be seen that a protective tariff stimulates invention. Under its influence the greatest proficiency has been attained in machinery and saving methods.

Mr. Chairman, men have almost recklessly invested their money in manufacturing enterprises during the last twenty-five years. They have done so because of their belief that they would have not so much a high market to sell in as a fair and steady market, and that their Government would stand over them with the shield of protection by which at no time could designing capital of Europe crush them by a combined movement. Under this benign influence millions of dollars have been invested and millions of men employed directly and indirectly. One invention has been added to another, waste and loss have been reduced to a minimum, and by the progress of invention every particle and fragment have been utilized for some beneficent purpose. Competition has sprung up on all sides. Wages have gone up and prices of goods have gone down. As a manufacturing people we are to-day making such rapid strides that unless some untoward misfortune, such as is implied in the Mills bill, overtake us we shall within a decade lead all the nations of the earth.

That a frightful surplus is accumulating in the Treasury no one will deny. So far as it has accumulated through the duties on foreign imports it is the result of our natural relations to the balance of the world. It could not be otherwise unless we choose to forego all advantages arising from our isolated condition, the value of our country to foreigners as a market, and the general prosperity of all who trade with us. To stop the flow of money to the Treasury would be like stopping the flow of blood to the heart and the result much the same. The remedy for the accumulation of a great surplus is in sending it out again through proper channels to perform its functions among the people; not by spending it like silly children, but by wise and judicious investments. What would a good business man do were he so fortunate as to accumulate in his safe a few thousand dollars more than he needs for current outlay? If he were doing business in a rented house he would probably put up one of his own which would be an honor to himself and an ornament to his town and the erection of which would give employment to the laboring men of his community.

The Government is to-day doing business all over the land in rented post-office buildings, many of which, even in cities of great importance, are inferior wooden structures, liable to burn down at any moment, and for which, too, exorbitant rents are often demanded. The Government should at once begin the erection of suitable buildings for post-offices and other Government purposes in every town where the Government business has attained any considerable magnitude.

Fortifications should be erected on our seacoast to protect our cities in case of war. I do not believe in war, and as a means of discouraging war I want to put ourselves in such condition that no nation will consider it safe or profitable to make war upon us. I would build a navy worthy of the great people that we are, and I would be prepared to demand that all international differences be settled by peaceable arbitration. I would encourage and foster the merchant marine by granting bounty for every league steamed or sailed in carrying the United States mails. I would make the bounty sufficiently ample to carry our mail and establish our trade in every nook and corner of the earth. I am sick of this cant about the tariff destroying our carrying trade and thus our merchant marine. Our carrying trade to-day is, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$1,400,000,000 annually, whereas it was but \$500,000,000 in 1860, an increase of nearly 300 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, the carrying trade is all right. The only trouble is that it is carried in British vessels. The British built and armed and equipped rebel privateers during our civil war, and under the guise of Confederate cruisers and under the protection of the Confederate flag they burned, or drove under foreign flags, the whole of our merchant marine; and they are now exacting from this country \$150,000,000 annually for having thus successfully usurped our carrying trade. Mr. Chairman, I want to see the national Treasury respond liberally to the demands made upon it to build up and foster our merchant marine, which, by proper encouragement, would be able to do its full share of the world's traffic and secure its full proportion of the world's wealth and lay it down at our doors.

I would see every soldier who served our country in the hour of her dire distress, or his widow, placed upon the pension-roll at fair rates for the remainder of life. [Applause.]

After what I have now enumerated, or even half of it, in the way of appropriate expenditure has been provided for, there will be no occasion to destroy our great economic system to get rid of the surplus as the Democrats of old burned their barns to get clear of the rats. Every dollar will be placed in circulation among the people, and that, too, through the hands of those who work for wages. All business will receive a new impetus and all departments of industry will flourish with new-born prosperity.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the time is near at hand when every

American will fully realize the importance of maintaining our American protective system, and when the laborer, the capitalist, the farmer, and the banker, the merchant, and the manufacturer may all unite to work out the great destiny of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some pleasure, and I am glad to think with some profit, to the discussion which has taken place on the pending bill. Freely, frankly, and gladly I say this. At the same time I must confess that often, very often indeed, have I been amused at the arguments made and ideas entertained by gentlemen upon the subject of tariff taxation. When I hear gentlemen say they would protect the wheat-grower, the corn-grower, the beef and pork fatterer, and many other things equally foolish, my face involuntarily becomes wreathed in broad smiles, which are beyond my power to suppress. The voicing of such ideas leads me to believe that nothing in the world so much confuses and confounds the average mind as the effort to solve the effect of reciprocity privileges in matters of trade.

Sirs, in the industries of this country we have those producing commodities which can not in the open markets of the world compete with similar commodities produced elsewhere. We also have those who produce commodities which in the open markets of the world can compete. Both these classes of our citizens produce commodities that enter into the traffic and commerce of our people, and are sent from locality to locality, from State to State, and those of one class from country to country, as the wants of the people of those localities, States, and countries may demand, always limited, however, by the ability to buy.

Besides these we have still others, and these constitute a very large per cent. of our people, performing that kind of labor which can only be performed in the locality where performed, and with which there can be no competition except by persons living in the locality where such labor is required.

All our people are consumers. The man who, by his labor, produces an article which, regardless of competition, can be sold in our own or shipped and sold in another country, needs no protection. To talk about protecting him is the sheerest nonsense. After you have protected him all you can he is still unprotected. All such men are interested in an unfettered and uninterrupted commerce.

The man who, however, produces that which can not compete, even in the markets at home, wants protection. If we are to have the benefit of the products his industry produces he must be protected. But how much ought he to be protected? More than is necessary to enable him to compete with the foreign producer? Not at all. He should be protected, if at all, to such an extent as will enable him to compete in the home market. If he can compete in foreign markets he needs no protection.

In all our legislation we must remember that all our people are consumers; that their rights and interests are to be considered. We must remember that a large per cent. of our people are producers of those things which sell in the open markets of the world—at home and abroad—and that their interests are not to be ignored.

Consumers want the widest market in which to buy. Producers who produce those things which sell in open and even-handed competition, want the privilege of the widest market in which to sell. If the wants of the consumer are to be curtailed, if the privileges of the unprotected producer are to be abridged, curtail and abridge those wants and privileges enough, and only enough, to protect the man who needs protection. Levy a tariff high enough to afford him such margins as will enable him to make and sell his goods. Do not make it so high as to cut off foreign competition. When you cut off reasonable competition you make of him a monopolist. When you have made of him a monopolist, with all the human nature inherent in the poisoned adder warmed into life, he turns and smites the hand that furnished the meat upon which he fed and thereby grew into strength.

"Competition is the life of trade." I would never lose sight of competition. As a protectionist—and I claim to be one—I would make my tariff high enough to enable our own people to compete. As a free-trader—and I claim to be one—I protest against making the tariff so high as to destroy competition from abroad. To deny protection at home builds up monopoly abroad; to prevent competition from abroad builds up monopoly at home. Trade and commerce give employment to labor, and the most profitable employment that can be given. To obstruct commerce is a detriment to every consumer. If all are consumers, then it is a detriment to all. To obstruct commerce is not only a detriment to every consumer, but is an additional detriment to every man who produces a surplus of that which is able to stand competition in the open markets abroad—that which could, and otherwise might, find its way to another land.

I belong to that numerous class of American citizens who believe in the greatness of our country, and in the greatness of her opportunities—in many, very many, yes, in the great majority of things, surpassing all the balance of the world; with her energies and efficiency unshackled capable of producing the grandest results.

In the production of all those things wherein we surpass all the rest of the world we should give ourselves the utmost freedom: while in

those things wherein others surpass us we need not fear the hurtful influence of giving them a reasonable show of freedom.

With the capacity of producing, and with profit, much that is needed abroad, we simply fetter our ability to sell by paralyzing their ability to buy. The man who has a thing for sale wants to find a buyer. The man who wants to buy looks for the man who has for sale. A sale and a purchase are the counterparts of each other. A sale is the mate of a purchase, while a purchase is the twin of a sale. Every device that denies us the right to buy from abroad anything that can be bought cheaper there than we can produce it here, only tends to prevent our selling abroad an equal amount of something that we can produce cheaper here than it can be produced abroad.

An individual, a single individual, if he has it to sell, can easily sell for money more than he buys. Why? Because all he has for sale is so incomparably small in proportion to the ability of the balance of the world to buy and pay money that he sells with comparatively little difficulty. The people of a great nation aggregating sixty millions of people, producing a great surplus and capable of producing a greater, find it difficult to fall in with persons able to buy. While an individual may sell more than he buys, if he buys more than he sells he must have funds to draw from, a credit to appeal to, or something that will be accepted in payment.

If he has no money, no credit, no property to exchange, but has labor to sell, he may sell his labor and buy. Labor being the only thing he has to exchange for the necessities of life, refuse to take his labor and he is unable to buy your goods, unable to buy your spare bread; refuse to take his labor, and his wife goes without the necessary raiment to keep her comfortable; refuse to take his labor, and his children cry for bread to appease their hunger. With want and starvation staring him in the face, he is ready to work at half price. Yes, rather than suffer his loving wife to shiver, rather than see his children starve, he works at quarter price.

With all his labor sold at quarter price he can not buy so very much. His inability to buy leaves you with an overproduction. Ay, the overproduction is not an overproduction; it is an underconsumption. Plenty of people to consume all that is made and a good deal more if liberally supplied, and plenty to make more if a price was found for the labor. The employer can not employ when he finds no market for his goods. An unnatural condition of things is brought about by an unnatural effort to build up something by legislation, instead of allowing it to be built by reason of the natural demand for it. By such methods, business, trade, and everything else is depressed because of the obstruction to natural laws.

The overcrowded populations of Europe, hemmed within circumscribed limits, handicapped for the want of opportunities, are suffering and starving for the indispensable necessities of life, and yet within easy reach of all those necessities if a sale for their labor could only be found. All to gratify the greed of the American cormorant, who is only interested in shackling labor that he may "corner" some commodity and give thereto a price higher than it would otherwise command, an unnatural selling price.

After thus philosophizing, Mr. Chairman, let us inquire how it is that the people of one country trade with the people of another country, and what are the ordinary means and usual methods of carrying on this trade. The merchants of one country buy from and sell to the merchants of the other country. Each buys what his customers need and are able to pay for; not just what their customers want, but what they are able to pay for. Tell me, sirs, that money is so plentiful in any country that the people can *ad libitum* pay money! If they can not pay money they must go in debt or sell the product of their labor.

The people of one country rarely become in debt to the people of another country for the little current trade thus taking place from day to day, from week to week, and from year to year, by sending back and forth the things as needed. These little balances are paid and settled without passing money. No indebtedness is suffered, except for short intervals. If any considerable indebtedness is incurred, it is by reason of the fact that the wealthy people of one country make loans for the purpose of making public improvements in the other country, or for the purpose of enabling the people of the other country to carry on war, or by making investments in such other country for their own individual purposes.

In making these loans the money is not sent over, but the material is bought and sent over with which to make the improvement, or the supplies to carry on the war are likewise bought and sent over.

England, by reason of her great wealth, in this way has made loans to many of the people elsewhere. And, generally speaking, not exactly loans, but they invest in stocks and become themselves the owners of the foreign properties. A few years ago we were importing more than we were exporting. All arising out of the fact that foreigners were taking stock in our railroads then being built. Now they are receiving their dividends by an excess of exports being sent them by us.

By reason of these investments England sent for long years more exports than she brought home imports. Now, by reason of the payment of

interest and of dividends, and of the receipt of incomes from foreign properties, she is importing largely more than she is exporting. Since 1871 her imports have exceeded her exports more than \$400,000,000 per annum, and yet, in the face of all this, she has during the same period of time imported more gold and silver than she has exported by more than \$100,000,000, or an average of more than \$5,000,000 per annum.

I mention this because the great idea of business with many people is to sell, and sell for money only; take nothing in exchange but money. Confine trade to such narrow limits and it is gone; it comes to a dead standstill. The history of trading between all nations shows that countries that do not produce the precious metals, gold and silver, and countries that produce less of these metals than their proportionate part based upon their wants, needs, and capabilities, as compared with the wants, needs, and capabilities of other countries, always import more gold and silver than they export, while countries that produce more of these metals than their proportionate part, considering their wants, needs and capabilities, always export more than they import. The United States, prior to 1849, the date of its becoming a precious-metal-producing country, imported more than she exported, while since she has exported very much more than she has imported. To give exact figures—taken from the American Almanac—the United States, for the twenty-five years ending June 30, 1849—

Imported (gold and silver).....	\$258, 820, 276
Re-exported (foreign).....	\$165, 565, 529
Exported (domestic).....	24, 300, 529

Total exported..... 189, 865, 058

Excess of imports (twenty-five years)..... 68, 955, 218

Excess averaging more than two and three-fourths millions per annum.

From June 30, 1849, to June 30, 1887, we imported gold and silver...	\$937, 450, 431
Re-exported (foreign).....	\$322, 541, 197
Exported (domestic).....	1, 818, 631, 834

Total exported..... 2, 141, 173, 031

Deduct total imports..... 937, 450, 431

Excess of exports..... 1, 203, 722, 600

Average annual exports..... 56, 346, 658

Average annual imports..... 24, 669, 748

Average annual excess of exports..... 31, 676, 910

I present these figures simply to show, if we are capable of producing large quantities of "stuff" that might be sold abroad but we refuse to so sell unless we are paid money, we are simply shutting the doors of commerce in our own face. The fact is that we are producing more than 30 per cent. of all the gold produced in the world and more than 40 per cent. of all the silver so produced—from seventy to one hundred million of dollars per annum out of about two hundred millions. What we do not produce is mostly produced in Australia, Mexico, and the South American countries. The European countries, countries in which we find the most and best market for our surplus, are not money-producing countries, and consequently are unable to buy with money. This makes it impossible to sell to them for money. They are money-importing and not money-exporting countries. The fact that we produce such a large per cent. of the gold and silver produced in the world makes it impossible for us to import more gold and silver than we export. The inevitable laws of trade decree otherwise. For short seasons, sometimes for two or three years at a time, this rule may be reversed, but it will later on average itself up. You had just as well try to dam up the Mississippi River at flood-tide with the grasses that vegetate upon its banks as to change the current of this natural law. If, therefore, we would sell our products abroad we must not be afraid of buying from abroad, because the only thing with which most foreigners can buy is with the product of their labor.

I have taken from pages 110 and 314 of the American Almanac certain figures from which I have formed the table marked Table A and made a part of my remarks. In said table is shown in one column the amount of money, gold and silver, in most all the countries of the world, and in another column the imports of said countries for the period of one year. By comparing these two columns together it will be seen that with the exception of Japan, British India, Spain, France, Mexico, and Portugal not a single one of the rest could buy at the rate they bought for the year reported for a whole year if compelled to buy with money only. The money—

In Germany would last her.....	Months. 7
In Belgium.....	51
In Great Britain and Ireland.....	5
In Italy.....	5

In all others less than five months, aside from those above excepted. And in those the money would last longer simply because they do not buy so much. Japan especially is a very exclusive government, never exactly fencing herself in by walls like China, but almost as exclusive in her intercourse with others.

The following is Table A, to which I have referred.

TABLE A.

Name of country.	Amount of imports.	Amount of gold and silver.	Amount of gold and silver per capita.
Argentine Republic.....	\$117, 123, 120	\$9, 000, 000	\$3.54
Australasia.....	298, 663, 465	70, 000, 000	25.01
Austria-Hungary.....	217, 438, 950	118, 500, 000	3.31
Belgium.....	283, 659, 000	132, 500, 000	23.93
Bolivia.....	6, 150, 000	5, 400, 000	2.32
Brazil.....	103, 691, 240		
Canada.....	104, 424, 561	13, 826, 000	3.07
Central America.....		2, 692, 000	.98
Chili.....	52, 888, 846	6, 000, 000	2.47
Colombia.....	12, 504, 000	4, 500, 000	1.50
Cuba.....		28, 181, 000	22.07
Denmark.....	58, 751, 508	18, 327, 000	8.74
France.....	846, 872, 600	1, 470, 300, 000	39.41
Germany.....	942, 744, 112	556, 920, 000	12.31
Great Britain.....	1, 748, 317, 360	680, 847, 000	19.31
Greece.....	21, 150, 345	5, 404, 000	2.73
Hayti.....		4, 780, 000	8.86
India, British.....	355, 668, 862	1, 027, 000, 000	4.07
Italy.....	515, 368, 950	220, 000, 000	7.73
Japan.....	32, 660, 390	139, 468, 000	3.80
Mexico.....	40, 285, 360	50, 000, 000	5.23
Netherlands.....	453, 627, 340	74, 489, 000	8.34
Peru.....	19, 250, 000	1, 882, 000	.62
Portugal.....	10, 563, 448	40, 000, 000	8.79
Russia.....	304, 496, 528	119, 769, 000	1.21
Spain.....	111, 737, 910	200, 000, 000	12.03
Sweden and Norway.....	94, 452, 760	17, 939, 000	2.77
Switzerland.....	197, 630, 185	31, 700, 000	11.14
Turkey.....	87, 272, 845	74, 800, 000	3.00
Uruguay.....	25, 275, 349	5, 601, 000	2.28
Venezuela.....	17, 256, 389	5, 000, 000	1.86

Our best market is England, to which we sell more than 50 per cent. of our exports; to Germany, France, Belgium, and other European countries fully 30 per cent. of the other 50. Yet there are men on this floor following the lead of the Plumed Knight, who would break down our trade with these countries, and at the expense of so doing make strained efforts at reciprocity treaties with South American and other new countries, so as to enable their constituents to exchange their manufactured products for the agricultural products of such new countries.

All that portion of our people who produce that which will sell, not only in our own markets, but in the markets of other countries, are interested in removing all obstacles that shackle commerce and trade. If we have those among us who produce that which can not be sold abroad, ay, that which in the open markets at home can not even stand the competition of foreign goods, they are of course interested in placing obstructions in the way of competition from abroad. So at last it depends altogether on where we live, and in what business we are engaged, whether in Pennsylvania or Indiana, in a locality that must needs beg quarter for their goods or in a locality that sends its goods into the broad markets to compete with everybody, as to whether we are interested in fettering trade. If that which Indianians have for sale can stand the competition not only at home but abroad, she wants an open field.

If that which certain individuals in Pennsylvania produce can not compete abroad, nor even at home, without fettering commerce, those individuals are of course interested in fettering commerce.

If we would sell to England, France, Germany, Belgium, and other European countries, we must make them able to buy. In the very nature of things they can not buy with money. They use gold and silver in the fine arts, and then there are "wear and tear" in that they have. Not being precious-metal-producing countries, they are compelled to buy their money.

In the fine arts gold and silver are used in making watches, jewelry, plated ware, and many other things. Pages 78 and 79 of the report of the Director of our own Mint shows that in 1885 we used in the fine arts \$11,152,120 of gold and \$5,198,413 of silver. Some years we use as much as \$20,000,000. The loss annually of gold and silver by friction and by use in the fine arts is almost equal to the annual output of all the mines of the world. The increase of output does not more than keep pace with the increase of wealth, population, and of business necessities. An unusual output has more of a tendency to go into the fine arts than to swell circulation.

My distinguished colleague, who has so long and so ably represented the Sixth Indiana district upon this floor [Mr. BROWN], told us a few days ago that "free trade is only safe between nations having equal industrial conditions. The nation possessing industrial advantages always destroys or cripples the trade of its weaker and less fortunate rival." In my judgment the industrial conditions in our own country are inferior to none, and on his own theory we ought to court free trade with every nation, but I deny that free trade with each other hurts either, so long as the weaker is not yoked to the stronger, and compelled to do its trading there. If there be other places with which

it can trade and is denied that right and compelled to trade with the stronger, then the stronger puts the weaker to the wall. What is true between nations is equally true between States. The mere fact of the jurisdictional line dividing the two being in the one case a line between nations wholly separate and independent of each other, or a line between States only partially separate and independent of each other, makes no sort of difference whatever.

Pennsylvania possesses superior advantages to Indiana in some things—coal and iron ore—and may be said to possess superior industrial advantages, and by reason thereof to be the superior of Indiana in "industrial relations." The fact that free trade exists between Pennsylvania and Indiana hurts neither, but it is the yoking of Indiana to Pennsylvania and compelling Indiana to buy Pennsylvania's iron, instead of allowing Indiana the unobstructed privilege of buying elsewhere. Pennsylvania has iron ore, coal, timber, good soil, and substantially everything we have in Indiana, her coal and iron ore being of a superior quality and more cheaply mined, and because of this far surpasses Indiana in her ability to make cheap iron, and she is the equal of Indiana in all the other items. Such being the case, she comes to Indiana and says:

"Let us form a compact; let's develop our resources and diversify our industries. If you will agree to pay us a little more for iron than you can buy it of England, that will enable us successfully to go into the business and develop the trade. But after being developed you must still continue to buy our iron."

Indiana says: "Well, you buy our wheat, beef, pork, and agricultural implements, and we will do it."

"Oh," says Pennsylvania, "we can't do that. We can raise all the wheat, beef, and pork, and make all the agricultural implements we want."

"Well," says Indiana, "unless you take our wheat, our beef, our pork, and our agricultural implements we will not have anything with which to pay you."

"Never mind, never mind," says Pennsylvania. "You sell your wheat, your beef, your pork, and agricultural implements to the fellows in Europe for money; this will enable you to pay us money."

"Yes," but says Indiana "those fellows in Europe, I am afraid, have no money; I understand they have none, but plenty of labor to produce the iron, and you know at last it is simply swapping labor."

"Oh, oh, oh, come," says Pennsylvania, "I see you don't understand this question. The fellows in Europe can sell their iron some place else and get the money."

"But," retorts Indiana, "where is she going to find a market for her iron?"

"Oh, pshaw!" says Pennsylvania, "that don't make any difference. She will find some place. Give yourself no trouble about that. Come, come; we will pile up the money here at home; that is what we are after. It will do us all good. We are ready to do the fair thing."

Yes, the proposition of the white man to the Indian to divide the game was equally fair when he said, "I will take the turkey and you may have the buzzard, or you may have the buzzard and I will take the turkey."

And here is the unequal contest to which the gentleman of pig-iron fame from Pennsylvania invites my colleague [Mr. BROWNE], whose district is an agricultural district and also a manufacturing district, but manufactures only that which will stand competition, not only at home, but also from abroad. The clever, whole-souled, good fellow that my colleague is, because of his enthusiasm on the subject of diversifying our industries and making our country great, walks right up to the yoke made to work on him, and allows his Pennsylvania friend to place it upon his neck, and then, like a dumb driven ox, submits to its galling influence.

My distinguished colleague further says:

The intelligent farmer knows that the policy that gives the country an extended and diversified industry is beneficial to him.

Yes, when the Revolutionary war closed and we became a separate and independent power on the face of the earth, the thirteen colonies, with the territory ceded therewith, aggregated about 800,000 square miles. Soon thereafter, in 1803, that far-seeing statesman, Thomas Jefferson, made the famous Louisiana purchase, by which we acquired 800,000 miles more of territory, thus enlarging our opportunities for extending and diversifying our industries.

In 1819 we took in Florida with 60,000 square miles adapted to orange culture, by which our industries were extended and diversified. Again in 1845, Texas with her 265,000 square miles became an easy acquisition; then by the Ashburton treaty our claim to the Oregon territory with its 310,000 square miles was acquiesced in—both largely extending our ability to diversify our industries. Then, as a result of the Mexican war the Rocky and trans-Rocky Mountain country, with its auriferous and argentiferous products came to us, containing over 500,000 more square miles of territory. Then New Mexico with its 56,000 square miles was purchased. Here was cheap land, and that gave us not only gold and silver, but cheap wool; then came Alaska giving us the seal fisheries, etc. But what more benefit was all this than it would have been under a foreign government, with the privilege granted and permanently secured to us of free ingress and egress and right to oc-

cupy and own the soil and trade back and forth without let or hindrance?

If diversified industry is a thing to be acquired by legislation, then the more legislation the better. The nearer brought home to our own doors the better. Let us change our Federal Constitution and allow States to obstruct the right of its citizens to purchase from other States. Let the States so amend their constitutions as to allow counties and townships the right to obstruct the purchase of things not made within their own little narrow limits. While my people have more interests in common with the people of Pennsylvania than with Europeans, they have more interests in common with other citizens of Indiana than with the citizens of Pennsylvania; and while they have more interests in common with other citizens of Indiana than with those of Pennsylvania, they have more in common with those found within the confines of the counties in which they live, and still greater when narrowed down to township limits.

Indians have a common interest in their State government and in the raising of funds to carry on the same. The residents of the county have the same interest, and a still further interest, in common in their own county affairs and in the raising of funds to provide for those affairs; and the citizens of the township have those same interests and also have still the further interests in common in township and municipal affairs and in the raising of funds to supply the sinews of war right at home.

We do not so much object to paying taxes for the general good of Indians, and less to paying taxes for the general good of those residents of the county, and still less to paying taxes for the general good of those residing in our township or city. But the Lord deliver us from paying taxes to build up and diversify Pennsylvania industries, and to put shekels into the pockets of a few dozen barons rich in a few hundred furnaces. Will my distinguished friend from Indiana offer a proposition to so amend the Federal Constitution as to give States the right to collect customs duties, and invite his Pennsylvania brethren to contemplate the change?

While we are greatly interested in wishing Pennsylvania well, my people are more concerned about where they can get their iron cheaper, and still more concerned about where they can the better exchange their own labor therefor, because at last if they can not swap their labor they are unable to buy. If they can swap a dollar's worth of labor for a dollar's worth of European labor, they are not entirely satisfied to give a dollar and a half's worth of labor to Pennsylvanians for what ought to be worth only a dollar, and if they can not even swap the dollar and a half's worth to Pennsylvania for the dollar's worth, because Pennsylvania does not want and has no use for the dollar and a half's worth, they are without the means to buy.

My distinguished colleague further says:

Duties should be increased, and particularly on rye, wheat, and potatoes, cabbage and other vegetables.

If my colleague thinks he can catch any of his constituents by the soft sop of increasing the duty on wheat he has a very low estimate of their intelligence. To say that he made the statement "to supply the home demand" for correct ideas would be to say the "home demand" is more in need of protection for intelligent school-teachers to diversify their ability to teach a little common sense. Canada is the only country from which we could import wheat successfully, and ours is the only country that can export wheat successfully to Canada. We charge a duty of 20 cents a bushel against them; they charge a duty of 25 cents per bushel against us. As a revenue measure this will do, but as a measure of protection, just to keep the two peoples from trading with each other, how foolish. Each country raises a surplus and that surplus finds a market in Europe. While my colleague from Indiana would protect rye, wheat, cabbage and other vegetables, other gentlemen would protect lumber, coal, iron ore, etc. The tariff on these things is not and never was a protective tariff. On these articles it is and always was a revenue tariff only.

My colleague quotes from Mr. Converse to show that successful military campaigns can not be carried on without woolen clothes for soldiers.

Ay, there is your key-note, and is the only point in the whole line of argument in favor of protection; the only argument that has any pretense of merit, in suffering taxation for the purpose of diversifying industries. If it is war we are preparing for, that is unquestionably a good argument; and especially if putting wool on the free-list is to annihilate the sheep. "In time of peace prepare for war," is an adage that found its way into the literature of the world when "war" was the rule and "peace" the exception.

In a greatly modified degree that adage still has some force in some of the European countries. With us it has no force, because with our surroundings and prospects "peace" may be regarded as the rule and "war" as the exception. To tax ourselves heavily for wool and the prime necessities of life with so little prospect of war and mainly to be prepared for war is borrowing trouble too far ahead. England has higher-priced land than we have and has more sheep according to population than we have, and according to territory sixteen times as many, and yet she puts wool on the free-list. Germany and France each have higher-priced land than we have and each have six times as many sheep according to territory as we have, and yet they each put wool on the

free-list. If these three first-class European powers, in close proximity to the warring nations of the world, can thus raise sheep and wool free and take the risk, why not we? My colleague further inquired why coal and iron ore were not placed on the free-list. I listened to hear, and hoped to hear him say, but he did not, that he was in favor of these materials going on that list. On account of the small value attached to coal and iron ore in comparison to the cost of transportation, whether on or off the free-list could make but little difference the one way or the other. The tariff on them is a revenue tariff and certainly not a tariff for protection. If placed on the free-list very little more would be imported than is now imported. The substantial good effect that would have grown out of it would be the effect it would have in removing the prejudice in the minds of many of our people against having anything placed on the free-list and in giving less pretense to those engaged in the protected industries for keeping up high duties.

If placed on the free list, where would we continue to get our coal? With possible rare exceptions, just where we get it now. The labor cost of mining coal and placing it on the cars is very small. If we are to rely on the information found in the second volume of Compendium of the Census of 1880, pages 1237 to 1245, inclusive, the coal mined in the United States during the census year, when mined and placed on the cars, was worth on an average all over the United States the sums of—

	Per ton.
For anthracite coal	\$1.47
For bituminous coal	1.25

At some places it was worth more, and at some places less, but this was the average. Pennsylvania furnished all the anthracite and a very large part of the bituminous. The latter in—

	Per ton.
Pennsylvania was worth.....	\$0.96
Maryland.....	1.15
West Virginia.....	1.15

Of the 42,000,000 tons mined during the census year 22,000,000 tons were mined in those three States. Taking the whole country on an average and the labor cost for mining was—

	Per ton.
For anthracite coal	\$0.79
Bituminous.....	.78

But in Pennsylvania the labor cost was only 61 cents per ton for bituminous, and but little more in Maryland, West Virginia, and in many of the other States. So that the labor cost was small, and it is smaller today.

When carried to market the cost is greatly increased, not by labor, but by transportation, the extent of increase depending on distance of transportation. At the little city where I live when at home coal, and that of a superior quality, can be and is put on the cars for about \$1 per ton. It is started East, West, North, and South, paying heavy freights on short hauls and from a half to three-fourths of a cent per ton per mile for long hauls. When it gets 100 miles off at a half a cent per ton 50 cents per ton are added for freight, and at three-quarters 75 cents per ton, and so it increases as it gets farther from home. It gets as far East as Cincinnati, as far West as St. Louis, as far South as Evansville, and as far North as Chicago. When it reaches the latter place, which is the most distant, being 258 miles, its chief cost is the cost of transportation. When it gets to Chicago it finds no competition from the pauper labor of Europe, but it finds the most nipping and close competition from the labor-producing coal coming from Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, and competition possibly not so nipping of other railroads leading into Chicago, but such as to require it, when it gets there, to be thrown upon the market at \$2.50 per ton.

If when it got there it would bring \$3.50 per ton, every person who has ever done business with railroads knows that the freight would be just \$1 per ton more. Railroads always make the rate so as to cover all margins. But leaving out of view the extra dollar, let us sum up the cost of transportation. Twenty flat cars carrying twenty or more tons each make a fair train-load; then:

20 flat cars, 20 tons each, 400 tons, \$2.50.....	\$1,000.00
Labor cost 400 tons, 60 cents per ton.....	240.00
Capital cost to mine owners, 40 cents per ton.....	160.00
1 conductor 2 days, \$5.....	10.00
1 engineer 2 days, \$4.....	8.00
1 fireman 2 days, \$3.....	6.00
2 brakemen 2 days each, \$1.50.....	6.00
Total labor cost.....	430.00
Other cost of transportation.....	570.00

Now, I imagine an intelligent coal-miner of my town becoming nervous for fear coal on the free-list would so cheapen the article that the railroad company would be forced to do its work cheaper or go out of the business.

For the purpose of further elucidating this coal matter, I looked up, that I might examine the question thoroughly, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year ending June 30, 1887, on commerce and navigation. I was specially led to do this because I received a circular from some coal-men in Southwest Virginia. I presume a copy of

the same circular was sent to all the other members of this House. These fellows down in Virginia claimed they were 360 miles from their nearest part of New England. They set up a terrible wail about their woe-begone condition in the event coal went on the free-list. They imagined they would go to the demerit bow-wows without the benefit of clergy. They could not stand the competition of Nova Scotia coal. All New England would get their coal from Nova Scotia. I first looked on the map. I found Pennsylvania with her cheap coal and cheap labor much nearer than Virginia. I next looked up Nova Scotia to see what manner of beast it was thus voraciously to "chaw" up these West Virginia people. When I found Nova Scotia I discovered her population equal to that of about two Congressional districts, mostly engaged in agriculture, and the balance in the fisheries. I then asked a Connecticut man—a Democrat, of course—where they got their coal. He answered, "Pennsylvania." I said, "I thought you got, or, if the duty was taken off, could get, your coal from Nova Scotia." He said, "Pshaw! the Nova Scotia coal is no good." "What kind is it?" said I. "A sort of rotten, semi-bituminous stuff. For manufacturing purposes it might do to mix with other coal. For domestic purposes no one would have it."

I then turned to look up our foreign coal trade. I got the report on commerce and navigation, to which I have already alluded. I turned about to its several tables and found all the coal imported and exported for the year ending June 30, 1887; wherefrom imported and whereto exported. The following is a statement of the same:

In 1887 we imported coal from—

British Columbia.....	\$1,084,097
Australia.....	921,856
Scotland and Ireland.....	633,009
Nova Scotia.....	44,235
Canada.....	25,272
England.....	29
All other countries.....	6,934
Total imports of coal.....	2,715,442

We exported to—

Canada.....	\$3,538,148
Nova Scotia.....	219,401
Newfoundland and Labrador.....	9,235
Cuba.....	373,883
United States of Colombia (South America).....	107,988
Mexico.....	43,803
England.....	46,359
British West Indies.....	27,161
Danish West Indies.....	51,281
French West Indies.....	23,947
Dutch West Indies.....	5,309
France.....	13,410
Germany.....	12,185
Hawaiian Islands.....	12,519
Venezuela.....	9,500
Porto Rico.....	6,120
All other countries.....	26,047
Total.....	4,526,323

From the above table it will be seen that the coal imported came mainly from Australia, British Columbia, Scotland, and Ireland. That coming from Australia and British Columbia was landed at San Francisco and Wilmington, Cal.; and when it reached those ports it sold at more than twice what our Indiana coal will sell for at Chicago, and this after deducting the 75 cents per ton tariff. That coming from Ireland and Scotland came as ballast—"a ground-hog matter." In fact, the coal imported and exported, except that imported into California and that exported to Canada and Nova Scotia was carried as ballast.

But what astonished me most was to find so large an amount exported and sold to Canada. Little Canada about supplied her full consumptive demand from us, and that in view of the dangerous and unobstructed proximity to Nova Scotia coal. Of that exported to Canada the anthracite was sold for \$4.15 per ton, the bituminous for \$2.65 per ton. A moment's reflection, with a mere modicum of common sense, would readily convince any one that coal on the free-list would not enable Nova Scotia to compete with our own coal people. Enough on the coal subject at present. I shall want to recur to the subject further on in my remarks, in connection with the manufacture of pig-iron.

During the present session of Congress to the present time almost every mail has brought me some circular on the subject of the tariff; so many, in fact, that I could not read them. I presume other members of the House have been afflicted in the same way. Generally speaking, they came from interested parties or parties who thought they were interested. Occasionally one came from a professional crank, who felt that he owed it as a duty to his country to enlighten members of Congress on the all-absorbing question. Among these circulars (not from the cranks, but the others) for weeks early in the session petitions poured in from California, Oregon, and Washington Territory by the basketful protesting against placing lumber on the free-list or disturbing the duty thereon.

Lumber on the free-list, if you were to believe the wail set up by them, and all the industries on the Pacific Slope were ruined. A receiver would have to be appointed. Bankruptcy was inevitable. The cheap labor of British Columbia would annihilate the lumber business in all that Western country. About the time the coming of these peti-

tions had reached a white heat, a grave and reverend seignior—Senator DOLPH, from Oregon—broke forth in the other end of the Capitol, chiming in with the lumber interests of that far-off country. But in his speech he cited the fact that from Puget Sound, in Washington Territory, last year there were shipped to China, Hong-Kong, the Hawaiian Islands, and other foreign countries, 103,000,000 feet of lumber, five times as much as the whole output of British Columbia, and he stated that he had no doubt that his own State—Oregon—had done as much, but confessed he had no figures as to his own State.

All this in the very teeth of the even-handed competition from British Columbia and the cheap labor of that sparsely settled province. Lumber chopped and made ready for market by Chinese cheap labor, which it was bemoaningly suggested would be imported into that "neck of woods" to do cheap work. The idea of a California timber-owner complaining about Chinese cheap labor in British Columbia when California had one hundred times as many Chinamen as had British Columbia, and when the average lumber-owner of California had been lying awake of nights scheming in his own mind how to utilize the cheap labor of China for nothing. Talk about borrowing trouble. The thought that troubled the old maid past three-score and ten to such an extent that it brought tears to her eyes and grief to her heart is nowhere.

Not only from the grave and reverend seignior of the other end of the Capitol, but from the honorable Representative from the Sixteenth Pennsylvania, come lamentations on the lumber question. He says:

Remove the duty from lumber and you immediately bring the hemlock and spruce and lower grades of pine of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the Canadas into direct and ruinous competition with the low grades of pine everywhere used for the same purposes as the hemlock and spruce, and particularly with the pine of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida. Following upon such action the mills will close, the laborer be thrown out of employment.

Mr. McCORMICK tells us that—

Reasonably accurate estimates fix the amount of hemlock in his district at 50,000,000,000 feet.

I was in hopes that Pennsylvania would give us a rest, but it seems she has a monopoly, not only of cheap methods for iron making, but that she has millions of other cheap things that she wants to make high by closing the doors against all her competitors. Now, when we begin to need a wider field in which to buy our lumber, the lords rich in a few million acres of cheap wood lands, lands which the good Lord above gave, we find the monster monopoly intrenching itself behind its ancient bulwarks. Away with such supreme selfishness! Down with all such monopoly!

The idea, the Government paying the homesteaders out West a bonus for growing trees; and by our tariffs on lumber paying a bonus for destroying trees. Sirs, lumber ought to go on the free-list; coal ought to go on the free-list; iron ore ought to go.

Mr. BAYNE. How about sugar?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I will tell you about sugar. I would like to see sugar go on the free-list, and I think it ought to go there; but I have said that I am willing to place the tariff high enough to enable our people to succeed in their efforts at competition. Sugar has about the hardest struggle to compete of any of our industries, and without protection would possibly go to the wall. The tariff on lumber, on coal, and on iron ore is not at all necessary to enable our people to compete. These industries will all flourish whether on the free-list or not. The reason I would like to see sugar go on the free-list is because I believe it would give us cheaper sugar. The gentleman from Pittsburgh, if I understand him, does not believe that reducing the tariff lessens the price of the protected article. If I thought as does the gentleman, I would favor keeping the duty intact on sugar, because it gives us a large revenue. The duty, however, by the Mills bill is reduced on sugar more than it is on pig-iron. And I know full well, and shall demonstrate before I get through, that Pennsylvania, with her cheap coal and cheap iron ore can, without any tariff, make pig-iron in competition with England or any other country.

Time is passing, Mr. Chairman, and it is about time I was beginning to get serious. We must protect our labor. Ay, yes, there is the rub. But who are our laborers that need protection? Our farmers? No, you can not protect them, for they are compelled as a matter of dire necessity to sell their products wherever the sun shines, the rain falls, or man eats, and stand all competition. The farmers constitute 44 and a fraction out of every 100 of our working people. Our trade and transportation people, consisting of merchants, clerks, rail-roads, teamsters, etc.? No, their vocations can not be taken from them by Europeans so long as Europeans keep away from our jurisdictions. These constitute 11 and a fraction out of every 100 of our working people. Our professional and personal-service people, consisting of lawyers, doctors, preachers, school-teachers, theatrical performers, real-estate and insurance agents, barbers, hotel-keepers, livery-stable keepers, washerwomen, State, county, city, and Federal officers, including post-masters, 'squires, country constables, Congressmen, *et id genus omne*? No, not these, thank God; the pauper labor of Europe does not disturb the equilibrium of our minds, the honorable gentlemen upon the other side of the House not excepted. We constitute 22 and a fraction out of every 100 of our people. Not our coal miners; unless by tariff revision they be let down some back stairway in the dark, they are secure. Not

our copper mining and copper manufacturing people for they can send their goods abroad and stand right on the battlements of the enemy's intrenchments and auction off their goods before the very eyes of the enemy. Surely not the few thousand of our people engaged in the petroleum business. The products of these laborers sell as readily in Europe as here. Besides, the Standard Oil fellows smell so badly that even protectionists are wishing them all sorts of bad luck. The sweet rains from heaven would fail to remove the odor of their business. Surely not our silver and gold mining people, for the good Lord in His infinite wisdom and goodness did not give the European people any gold and silver to work in. But, finally, what portion of our manufacturing people need protection from the baleful influences of competition with the pauper labor of Europe? Let us inquire. Not our printers or newspaper men; not our carpenters, brick or stone masons, plasterers, painters, plumbers, paper-hangers, or any one connected with house-building or house-repairing—paupers in Europe, with all their meanness, have never attempted to build a house and send it over here, nor have any of our people sent a house over there to get repaired; our milliners, dressmakers, seamstresses, tailors, and tailoresses—these have to reside here; not our bakers, our butchers, our grist-mill employes, our quarry men, our brick and tile makers, our blacksmiths, car-shop and foundry men, boot or shoe makers, saddle and harness makers, tanners, curriers, and all others working in leather—we can beat the world in leather, if you will only leave out kid gloves: six employes in a first-class establishment can make a \$7 pair of boots in ten minutes by the watch; not our planing-mill men, sash, doors, and blinds factory men, wood-choppers, wood-turners, loggers, raftsmen, saw-mill men, furniture makers, cooper, and all others engaged in working wood, because we took out a patent on this business after England, Germany, France, and other first-class European powers lost their trees; nor those engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements, numbering over 39,000 (although, by mistake, the President, in his annual message designated them as numbering only 4,891), and those engaged in making wagons and carriages, numbering over 45,000. And right here let me pause to remark, parenthetically of course: the largest wagon-manufacturing establishment in the world is in my own State—Indiana. The Studebakers, at South Bend, Ind., make more, better, and cheaper wagons than are made anywhere else in the world. And not only make, but ship their wagons to all parts of the world and sell them in competition with wagons made in the cheap-labor districts of Europe. If they were given the privilege of buying their iron and steel cheaper (in the making of agricultural implements the iron and steel used in their making costs more than the labor of the employes engaged therein), and a few other things used by them, but which are made higher by tariff duties, they could still more easily sell their wagons abroad.

Our agricultural implements are among the best and sell abroad in South America, Australia, and in most of the countries of Europe. Although sold in Europe cheaper than they are sold here at home, still at a good profit nevertheless. Our sewing-machines (the labor cost of making one is only from \$4 to \$6) are also sold in Europe, and nowhere so much as in England, Germany, and France, England leading all other countries. England with her free trade is not only our best customer in the purchase of our agricultural products, but she buys more of our manufactured products than any other country of the world. The people of that country may be pig-headed, but they understand their own best interests. With her highest-priced labor of any country in Europe she has no trouble in competing with the cheaper labor of France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium, and with the country possessing the cheapest labor she competes the easiest and most successful.

But let us revert to the proposition, what portion of our labor, if any, needs protection? And how much does it need? My distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] incidentally mentions them as those engaged in manufacturing iron and steel, cottons, woollens, hemp, leather, silks, earthenware, china, glass and glassware, and paper. About eight hundred thousand in all, or less than 5 per cent. of our laboring people. I assure him he could, with the utmost safety, have left out those working in leather. My own best judgment is that most if not all those named by my colleague need but very little protection, and that most if not all the protection given them only benefits the less than ten thousand employers under and for whom these less than eight hundred thousand laborers are working. These ten thousand employers constitute less than one out of fifteen hundred of our people. Certainly all pretended protection given them, beyond what is necessary to protect and enable them to continue their occupations without greater disturbance from foreign labor is an injury and not a benefit to their employes. To prove that fact shall be my effort to show, because if the wages of these employes are kept up to the same standard and as much employment given them under a reduction of the tariff they would be benefited.

I maintain that all reductions made that do not have the effect of crippling those carrying on manufacturing industries will, to the extent that it cheapens goods, cause a greater consumption of the goods, thereby creating additional demand for them and for the labor that produces them, and, as a consequence, greatly benefit employes by increasing the demand for their work by giving them cheaper things en-

able them to consume more and live better. Where the materials used, which constitute a chief part of the cost, can be obtained as cheaply here as in Europe, to the extent these materials enter into as a factor or element of cost no protection is needed, and where not needed should not and really can not be given. If given, it only operates to create monopoly.

Of the protected industries iron and steel, cotton goods and woolen goods are the most important, and of these iron and steel stand at the head and front of all the offending. Iron and steel enter not only into our private wants, but become a great factor in our public improvements—in fact are the mudsills upon which the substratum of our railroads and many other improvements, both public and private, are built.

Clothes only last a short time and have to be renewed often. Iron and steel last for years and need renewals less frequently. Clothing though of prime and most necessary importance is but a temporary investment. Iron and steel become a sort of continuous investment.

Ten dollars per ton on steel rails saves a thousand dollars per mile for every mile of railroad built, to say nothing of side tracks. Ten dollars per ton on iron saves almost as much more in the cost of rolling-stock, bridges, and other appurtenances to railroads. Two thousand dollars per mile is a big sum in the building of railroads, and if it could be saved more, many more, miles of railroad would be built, giving additional employment to labor. Freight and passenger tariffs would be greatly reduced. The people interested in the use of roads, in cheaper freights and passenger tariffs, would save the interest on two thousand dollars per mile in their continuous use.

Last year we built 13,000 miles of railroad. Two thousand dollars per mile would have been \$26,000,000. That sum and the interest thereon become a vast sum. But railroads are not the only things which interest us in cheap iron and steel. Cheapen the machinery in our grist-mills, saw-mills, planing-mills, woolen-mills, cotton-mills, and the machinery in all our manufacturing establishments of every kind, wherever used, and our manufacturers can turn out cheaper goods of all kinds, because they need not lay aside so much of the earnings to cover interest. This will greatly cheapen the manufacturing plant and better enable our capital to compete with European capital.

That we can make pig-iron and steel rails almost as cheap, if not fully as cheap, as they can be made in England or elsewhere, any one who will take the pains to investigate, from a common-sense standpoint, may and can easily satisfy himself.

He who imagines that the per diem wages paid cut much figure in the cost of iron, steel, cotton, or woolen goods will readily become convinced of his mistake by a little common-sense investigation.

The cheapness of material, the effectiveness of labor, and surrounding conditions are far more important factors.

To prove this let facts be submitted. I will first take up pig-iron that being the substratum of all iron and steel values. The chief element of cost in making pig-iron is the cost of the iron ore and the fuel. These are as cheap in this country as they are in Europe; in fact, in places in this country, cheaper. Our census reports (see volume 2, Compendium 1880, pages 1237 to 1243, inclusive) show that the value of the anthracite coal (mined only in Pennsylvania) mined during the census year was worth \$1.47 per ton, and of this value 79 cents were for labor cost; that the bituminous coal mined—averaging the whole United States over—was worth \$1.25 per ton, and that the labor cost for mining was 78 cents per ton; that while such was the average value all over the United States, in Western Pennsylvania its value was 96 cents per ton, and the labor cost for mining 61 cents per ton. In Clearfield, Bradford, and Tioga Counties, Pennsylvania, it was worth \$1.24 per ton, but the labor cost for mining, only 58 cents. In Maryland, \$1.15 per ton, but only 61 cents labor cost for mining.

The report of the chief of the bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania, made in 1885 for the year 1884, shows that during that year (1884) the labor cost in Allegheny, Clearfield, Fayette, and Westmoreland Counties, where more than 16,000,000 tons of coal were mined, was but 48½ cents per ton. Allowing 25 cents per ton for the labor of converting about a fourth of the coal into coke. The labor cost of mining iron ore in Berks, Blair, Centre, Chester, Clarion, Cumberland, Huntingdon, Bedford, Lancaster, Lebanon, Lehigh, Northampton, Perry, and Snyder Counties, in that State, was, on an average, 69 cents per ton, while in Lebanon County 392,941 tons were mined by one hundred and sixty-five men, working three hundred days each, at a labor cost of only 17 cents per ton, each hand averaging over 7 tons per day. Think of it! Just like shoveling sand out of a sand-pit. Plenty of just such places can be found in the United States.

Now, during the census year ending June 30, 1880 (see volume 2, Compendium, pages 1138 to 1141, inclusive), there was invested in blast-furnaces in the United States \$105,151,176. All these were not in operation, but such as were turned out 3,787,021 tons of pig-iron, valued at \$89,315,569.

For the purpose of getting at the surrounding conditions, which, I have stated, is a chief and all-important factor of cost in the production of pig-iron, I have, from data found in volume 2, pages 1138 to 1141, Compendium 1880, formulated the following table, showing the number of blast-furnaces in the United States, in what State located, aggregate number of tons and stated values per ton of materials used, and quantity and value of product made.

TABLE B.—Materials used and products made in the blast-furnaces of the United States, as per census. (See second volume, pages 1133, 1139 1140, and 1141.)

Number of establishments.	Location of establishments.	Iron ore.			Bituminous coal.			Anthracite coal.			Coke.			Total product.	
		Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons of pig-iron.	Value, aggregate.
490	United States	7,256,684	\$33,205,298	\$4.58	1,051,753	\$2,065,887	\$1.99	2,615,182	\$8,012,755	\$3.06	2,128,255	\$8,129,240	\$3.86	3,787,021	\$89,315,569
167	Pennsylvania.....	3,838,455	17,720,502	4.60	215,720	519,768	2.41	1,921,588	5,631,922	2.91	\$1,054,452	3,563,566	3.37	1,930,311	45,573,740
82	Ohio.....	953,088	5,147,695	5.41	638,711	1,170,089	1.83	(*)	418,624	1,601,300	3.82	548,712	13,038,193		
39	New York.....	609,642	2,315,439	3.80	(*)	(*)	(*)	496,684	1,252,009	3.13	34,237	182,694	5.33	313,368	6,816,241
13	New Jersey.....	314,199	1,511,942	4.80	(*)	(*)	(*)	225,713	779,676	3.40	17,000	108,278	6.36	157,414	3,428,747
8	Wisconsin.....	182,934	1,074,120	5.85	15,540	47,450	3.26	18,052	103,799	5.74	55,896	355,386	6.00	118,282	3,295,835
20	Michigan.....	201,179	1,162,961	4.80	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(†)	(†)	(†)	119,586	3,145,062
7	Illinois.....	150,540	924,750	6.14	27,715	86,220	3.11	11,205	65,249	5.82	101,440	624,490	6.15	95,468	2,391,850
12	Missouri.....	169,982	772,012	4.54	21,576	59,028	2.70	(*)	(*)	(*)	110,730	673,170	6.10	95,050	2,227,017
12	West Virginia.....	134,538	626,758	4.65	4,047	4,907	1.21	(*)	(*)	(*)	120,737	348,047	2.88	80,050	1,631,096
12	Alabama.....	142,286	138,640	.97	7,000	10,500	1.50	(*)	(*)	(*)	42,035	154,451	3.67	62,336	1,405,356
19	Kentucky.....	102,667	373,474	3.64	58,245	90,499	1.55	(*)	(*)	(*)	37,275	121,690	3.30	58,108	1,248,652
8	Tennessee.....	102,656	217,780	2.03	9,000	11,250	1.13	(*)	(*)	(*)	74,408	182,241	2.45	47,873	840,022
18	Connecticut.....	46,147	242,542	5.25	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(†)	(†)	(†)	18,779	644,911
9	Georgia.....	61,194	97,997	1.60	1,000	2,000	2.00	(*)	(*)	(*)	33,605	103,750	3.08	23,099	456,890
3	Indiana.....	31,744	218,458	6.88	54,100	93,450	1.72	(*)	(*)	(*)	1,418	6,143	4.33	18,237	460,535
29	Virginia.....	40,759	81,204	1.99	(†)	(†)	(†)	(†)	(†)	(†)	8,753	45,953	5.25	17,906	440,695
4	Massachusetts.....	21,564	88,326	4.05	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	9,043	312,810
1	Oregon.....	7,846	8,788	1.12	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(†)	(†)	(†)	3,200	78,393
1	Texas.....	3,240	6,480	2.00	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(†)	(†)	(†)	4,400	36,000
1	Vermont.....	1,050	8,100	7.71	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(†)	(†)	(†)	620	24,800

* Uses other fuel.

† Uses charcoal.

‡ Not reported.

In addition to the material disclosed in the above table there was used—
 53,909,828 bushels of charcoal, valued at..... \$3,679,120
 3,169,149 tons of fluxing material, valued at..... 2,547,336
 Other material, kind not designated, valued at..... 910,667

Making the aggregate stated value of these materials..... 7,137,113

Now, by scanning over this table, we find iron ore, taking the average all over the United States, valued at \$4.58 per ton, and ranging all the way from 97 cents per ton in Alabama up to \$7.71 per ton in Vermont; bituminous coal averaging all over the United States at \$1.99, and ranging all the way from \$1.13 per ton in Tennessee to \$3.26 per

ton in Wisconsin; anthracite coal averaging all over the United States at \$3.88 per ton, and ranging from \$2.91 in Pennsylvania to \$5.74 per ton in Wisconsin, and coke averaging all over the United States at \$3.88 per ton and ranging in value from \$2.45 per ton in Tennessee to \$6.15 in Illinois. Think of it, my friends. Think of it ye who labor and are heavy laden. Iron ore at \$4.60 per ton, bituminous coal at \$2.41 per ton, anthracite coal at \$2.91 per ton, coke at \$3.37 per ton. What a commentary on the loving kindness of the good people, among whom are the meek and lowly miners getting about 15, possibly 20 per cent. of these values for their labor while speculation and transportation are getting the balance. Shame on such protection.

Now, let us see who is benefited by these prices. How much product—\$89,315,569; and in what does its value consist. Let us see:

7,256,684 tons iron ore at \$1.58 per ton.....	\$33,205,278
1,057,753 tons soft coal at \$1.99 per ton.....	2,095,887
2,615,182 tons hard coal at \$3.88 per ton.....	8,012,755
2,128,255 tons coke coal at \$3.80 per ton.....	8,129,240
53,909,828 bushels charcoal.....	3,679,120
Fluxing material.....	2,547,336
Other material.....	910,667
Total cost materials.....	58,580,283
Labor cost making 3,787,021 tons of pig-iron at \$3.35 per ton.....	12,680,703
Total.....	71,260,986
Profit to capital.....	18,054,583
	89,315,569

Now let us proceed to make reasonable allowances and draw our deductions.

Ten per cent. on the capital invested ought to be enough; \$2.58 per ton on the iron ore ought to be enough; \$1.39 per ton for the bituminous coal ought to be enough; \$1.88 per ton on the anthracite coal ought to be enough; \$2.36 per ton on the coke ought to be enough. Every one familiar with the values of these materials knows that I have allowed enough. Those not familiar should refer to pages 1237 to 1243, volume 2, Compendium Census, and to pages 83 and 93 of the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of Pennsylvania. On the fluxing material, charcoal, and other material, valued at over \$7,000,000, I have no data from which to estimate. Hence I shall leave them unassailed, although I have no doubt these should stand their pro rata share of discounts.

This enables us to deduct from the capital all above 10 per cent. on the amount invested.

	Per ton.
On the iron ore all above.....	\$2.58
On the soft coal all above.....	1.39
On the hard coal all above.....	1.88
On the coke all above.....	2.36

Let us proceed accordingly.

Profit on capital.....	\$18,309,691
Allow 10 per cent.....	10,515,176
Amount deducted.....	\$7,794,415
Iron ore.....	33,205,278
Allow \$2.58 per ton.....	18,691,910
Amount deducted.....	14,513,368
Soft coal.....	2,095,887
Allow \$1.39 per ton.....	1,485,836
Amount deducted.....	610,051
Hard coal.....	8,012,755
Allow \$1.88 per ton.....	4,120,741
Amount deducted.....	3,892,014
Coke.....	8,129,240
Allow \$2.36 per ton.....	4,936,855
Amount deducted.....	3,192,385
Total deductions.....	29,196,030

The amount of pig-iron made was 3,781,021 tons, which divided into \$29,196,030 makes \$7.75 per ton on the pig-iron, and at that time the tariff was only \$7 per ton; more than enough to offset the tariff, to say nothing of ocean freights. Now, sirs, without invading the alleged value of over \$7,000,000 worth of charcoal, fluxing and other material, I have eliminated more from the cost of the pig-iron than the whole tariff, and left enough to cover reasonable profits to capital and an abundance to pay for transportation at reasonable prices. My friend from Ohio [Mr. FORAN] says that capital can not work as cheap in this country as in Europe. It never will unless forced to do so; when forced to do so it will be found as full of activity here as any place in the world, and will adapt itself to the necessities. Necessity is the mother of invention. Capital will not be long in devising methods to meet the requirements, while the labor in these industries will command and receive what is established by the standard paid to other labor. Ninety-five per cent. of our people are working in other industries, and the price paid these, they being the bulk, will regulate and control the price paid the few. That labor is usually paid most which is most difficult and unpleasant to perform.

Mr. BAYNE. The question I desired to ask the gentleman was, how the 70 per cent. duty on sugar proposed by the Mills bill suits him?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I understand the Mills bill reduces the duty on sugar 20 per cent.

Mr. BAYNE. But 70 per cent. is a very high rate.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Yes, sir, it is very high, but the reduction is considerably greater than the reduction on pig-iron. Our conditions, sir, for raising sugar in this country are not good on account of being too much subject to loss by overflow every two or three years and by frost every two or three years. For these reasons I regard it as impolitic to try to compete with Cuba and other more favored countries. The margins for sugar-raising are small, but considerable capital is invested in the sugar industry. It has not been thought proper

by any reductions made by the Mills bill to destroy any industry. Our conditions for making cheap iron in this country are as good as they are any place in the world. Considering the large margins in the profits on iron making, I regard the reduction from \$6.72 to \$6 on pig-iron as a much smaller reduction than the 20 per cent. reduction on sugar. We import nine-tenths of our sugar and produce but one-tenth. The duty goes into the Treasury. The duty, high as it has been and high as it is left, has not enabled any of our people to make a monopoly of furnishing us sugar.

We produce nine-tenths of the iron and steel consumed by us, and import only about one-tenth. The duty on the one-tenth goes into the Treasury while the increased price on nine-tenths goes into the pockets of our iron-mongers, among whom a large portion are constituents of the gentleman.

The large margin given by the duties on iron has created a monopoly and enables the iron men to limit the output and run up the price at times to the full limit of the margin given by the duty. The iron monopolists can better afford to suffer an importation of one-tenth of all we use than to lose nine-tenths of their profits.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman's proposition strikes me as strange logic.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I am not surprised that anything should strike the gentleman as strange which proposes to reduce the tariff on pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE. But if \$6.72 per ton is paid on pig-iron that goes into the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. It does so far as imported pig-iron is concerned, but as to the pig-iron produced in the neighborhood of Pittsburgh it goes into the pockets of the manufacturer of pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE. But if \$6.72 per ton is paid on pig-iron, that \$6.72 goes into the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. So far as imported pig-iron is concerned it does; but if the gentleman will study the figures already given and another statement I have prepared especially for his edification, if he has not already a part of the pork in his pocket, he will see where the \$6.72 per ton on the pig-iron made in and about Pittsburgh goes or has gone. The facts from which I make this statement I find in volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1138, 1139, 1140, and 1141. In this book and upon these pages I find that during the census year in the whole State of Pennsylvania there was invested in blast furnaces \$44,596,850. I find she made 1,930,311 tons of pig-iron, valued at \$23.55 per ton, or in the aggregate at the sum of \$45,573,750. To make this pig-iron she paid—

For labor (\$2.46 per ton).....	\$4,752,828
For materials.....	29,675,075
Making the alleged cost.....	34,427,903
Leaving for profit only.....	11,145,847

But does any one believe the materials cost or were worth any such sum? Let us see. Of what did those materials consist? The following is an inventory, namely:

3,838,455 tons iron ore at \$4.60 per ton.....	\$17,720,502
1,921,588 tons hard coal, at \$2.91 per ton.....	5,631,922
215,588 tons soft coal, at \$2.41 per ton.....	579,768
1,054,452 tons coke, at \$3.37 per ton.....	3,563,566
1,970,921 tons fluxing material.....	1,490,928
4,928,919 bushels charcoal.....	324,757
156,223 other materials not named.....	415,132
Aggregate.....	29,675,075

Having no knowledge of the value of the three last items—fluxing material, charcoal, and "other" material—we pass them over.

Our own knowledge of the value of coal, coupled with the information obtained from second volume Compendium Census 1880, pages 1237 to 1243, both inclusive, and from Legislative Document, volume 2, 1885, in which is found the report of the chief of the bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania upon the subject of the cost of mining coal and iron ore in the State of Pennsylvania, enables me to make estimates and eliminations as follows:

First profit on capital.....	\$11,145,847
Allow 10 per cent. on capital invested.....	4,459,085
Amount deducted.....	\$6,686,762
3,838,455 tons iron ore, at \$4.60.....	\$17,720,502
Allow \$2.60.....	10,043,586
Amount deducted, \$2.....	7,676,916
1,921,588 tons hard coal, at \$2.91.....	\$5,631,922
Allow \$1.91.....	3,710,334
Amount deducted, \$1.....	1,921,588
215,588 tons soft coal, at \$2.41.....	\$519,768
Allow \$1.41.....	304,180
Amount deducted.....	215,588
1,054,452 tons coke, at \$3.37.....	\$3,563,566
Allow \$2.37.....	2,509,114
Amount deducted.....	1,054,452
Total deductions.....	17,555,152

Nine dollars and nine cents per ton on the 1,930,311 tons of pig-iron made just makes the above net sum of \$17,555,152. Nine dollars and nine cents is \$2.37 more than your persistent \$6.72. With this \$2.37 we can allow \$1 more per ton on your iron ore and 2 per cent. more interest on the capital invested. What does my friend from Pittsburgh have to say now?

Mr. BAYNE. If my friend will go to the iron regions of Pennsylvania I think he will find, if he can run a mill on the principle he suggests, that I would be safe in guarantying him a salary of \$50,000 a year.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I thank you. I am not in the pig-iron business. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. Such management as that might induce the gentleman to abandon politics and go into the pig-iron business.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. No, sir; I do not propose to become *particeps criminis* to your methods of robbery. I would like to go over into that region to teach economy and how to get an honest divide to the poor laborers who furnish the sweat and the muscle by which the large margins upon coal, iron ore, and pig-iron are made. They could well afford to pay \$100,000 for a man half as smart as I am even in the pig-iron business. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Is the gentleman aware that there are companies engaged in mining iron ore the stock of which (the par value of the share being \$25) has been sold for \$2,000 a share, a very considerable advance?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Yes, that is quite an advance—only 8,000 per cent. I am not versed in the intricacies of protection as affecting business about Pittsburgh.

Mr. SCOTT. My remark does not apply to Pittsburgh, but to the iron-ore regions of the Northwest, where the great bulk of the iron ore of the United States is produced.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I have no doubt the gentleman's statement is correct. Although somewhat skeptical, I am prepared to believe anything relating to the combinations and trusts for keeping up the price of pig-iron.

Mr. SCOTT. I repeat the statement that in such companies shares of stock originally issued at \$25 per share have been sold as high as \$2,025 per share.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Just so; and were it not that the gentleman from Pittsburgh has advertised himself so extensively, I should be surprised at the gall he exhibits in always putting in his oar, like a mousing owl, when any one mentions the subject of pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE rose.
Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. If the gentleman will sit down I will give him all he wants to hear.

Mr. BAYNE. Just one moment.
Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. When the coal of fire begins to warm through the shell the tortoise begins to crawl. No, sir; my time is limited, and I can not suffer further interruptions.

Mr. BAYNE. Will not the gentleman allow me—
Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Not at all. I have submitted to all the interruptions from the gentleman, who is all the time seeking to occupy the floor at the expense of another's time, that I wish to. [Laughter.] I ask the gentleman to sit down.

I claim, sir, to have given some attention to the question of making pig-iron. I know the chief cost is the materials, namely, iron ore, fuel, and limestone rock. By the use of these materials in the year 1884 (see report chief bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania) the furnace employes in Pennsylvania made 2,092,754 tons of pig-iron. For their labor, therefore, they were paid \$4,333,783, or \$2.07 per ton. But this was the average, and in that same chief's report I find that much of the 2,092,754 tons cost less. On page 94 of that report I find where one furnace turned out 27,488 tons, and that the laborers for their work in making it were paid \$39,313, or only \$1.45 per ton. I know, sir, that day wages are higher in this country than in Europe, but, sir, it is cheaper because more effective.

I find in No. 64 of our consular reports, made in June, 1886, an official communication from J. Schoenhoff, our consul at Tunstall, a very carefully-prepared detailed statement of the relative cost of iron ore and coal used in the making of pig-iron in the United States and in England and in Germany. His information about the cost in this country I see he takes from the second volume of our Census Compendium, 1880, and the report of the chief of statistics of Pennsylvania, by me already referred to, and I take it his information as to cost in England and Germany is equally as reliable, and I commend the communication to the prayerful consideration of my friend from Pittsburgh. Mr. Schoenhoff tells us that England's advantage over us, if any, is in the fact that her materials—coal and iron ore—are closer together; that the average distance required to remove all home iron ore—except what is imported—is 45 miles; that Germany's advantage, if any, consists in the fact that the government owns all iron ore and coal lands and that no royalties are paid—a most wise and beneficent arrangement. He tells us, however, that 189,248 coal miners in Germany, for the year 1885, mined only 51,867,646 tons, or an average of only 274 tons per employe; that the coal when mined is not as good as ours; that in England employes average 325 tons per employe per year.

In the United States our miners average a much larger quantity.

Take Allegheny, Clearfield, Fayette, and Westmoreland Counties in Pennsylvania (see report Chief Statistics, already referred to, page 83) and we find 24,928 employes, which includes all hands inside and outside, working on an average of 200½ days each in 1884, aggregating 4,996,911 days' work, turned out 12,365,550 tons of coal besides making 3,694,710 tons of coke. Ordinarily it requires 1½ tons of coal to make 1 ton of coke, therefore requiring 4,618,387 tons of coal. Thus showing that each employe averaged 681 tons of coal to say nothing of the time consumed in making the more than 3,000,000 tons of coke.

Following Mr. Schoenhoff further and we find that our employes working iron-ore mines turn out a much larger quantity of ore. And last but not least our ore is as rich, producing as large a per cent. of metal, and our coal is unsurpassed.

Having put the knife to pig-iron and found that those engaged in making it and in furnishing and transporting the material out of which it was made, realized \$7.75 per ton, more than enough to cover good fair profits, taking the average all over the United States and \$9.09 in Pennsylvania, let us take the rolling-mills and put them through the same process of purification and elimination through which we have put the blast-furnaces, and what do we find? See volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1144 to 1151, both inclusive:

Capital invested.....	\$89,781,990
Total value products.....	136,798,574
Cost of these products:	
Paid wages to labor.....	\$34,004,799
Paid for material.....	88,277,233
Total cost.....	122,282,032
Profit to capital.....	14,516,542
Total.....	136,798,574

But of what did the materials consist? Let us take an inventory.

1. Iron ore.....	363,959 tons, \$7.41 per ton.
2. Pig-iron.....	} 2,705,509 tons, \$25.05 per ton.
3. Old iron rails.....	
4. Other old scrap-iron.....	
5. Hammered iron-ore blooms.....	
6. Hammered pig or scrap blooms.....	114,762 tons, \$48 per ton.
7. Purchased muck bars.....	
8. Charcoal.....	2,569,756 bushels.
9. Hard coal.....	5-6, 126 tons, \$2.58 per ton.
10. Soft coal.....	3,915,377 tons, \$2.31 per ton.
11. Coke.....	14,834 tons, \$3.27 per ton.

With the above data let us proceed to make our allowances and draw our deductions.

1. Profit on capital.....	\$14,516,542
Allow 10 per cent.....	8,978,199
Amount deducted.....	\$5,538,343
2. 363,959 tons iron ore, at \$7.41 per ton.....	\$2,700,167
Allow \$2.58 per ton.....	939,014
Amount deducted.....	1,761,153
3. 2,705,509 tons pig, old iron rails, and other old iron, \$25.05 per ton.....	\$67,779,633
Allow, less \$7.75, or \$17.30.....	46,811,939
Amount deducted.....	20,967,694
4. 114,762 tons hammered iron ore blooms, hammered pig and scrap blooms, and purchased muck bar, at \$48 per ton.....	\$5,507,676
Allow \$25.....	2,899,100
Amount deducted.....	2,608,576
5. 526,126 tons hard coal, at \$2.58.....	\$1,358,077
Allow \$2.08.....	1,095,014
Amount deducted.....	\$263,063
6. 3,915,377 tons soft coal, at \$2.31.....	\$9,047,054
Allow \$1.81.....	7,089,366
Amount deducted.....	1,957,688
7. 14,834 tons coke, at \$3.27.....	\$48,589
Allow \$2.77.....	41,172
Amount deducted.....	7,417
Total deductions.....	\$33,133,934

Total products, 2,353,248 tons, or \$14.07 per ton on the rolled iron. On account of the fact that rolling-mills are further from the places where fuel is produced than furnaces are or should be, I have allowed higher prices for coal and coke used in the rolling-mills than I have for that used in the blast-furnaces, and yet reference to the census reports will show that the rolling-mills estimated these materials at a lower price than did the blast-furnace. It will be observed that most of the deductions have been made on account of profit on capital and the \$7.75 per ton on pig-iron, which we found could be eliminated by our calculations made on the blast-furnaces. A similar calculation on Bessemer-steel rails would enable us to reduce that product to a value below \$30 per ton. In view of these estimates it would seem that the tariff on pig and rolled iron and steel rails is much, very much, too high in the Mills bill unless we are anxious to give the producers of these commodities the power to combine and run up prices. One-half the amount levied in the bill would give our home producers an advantage such as to enable them to hold the markets just as well as they can now. As long as Pennsylvania can realize a profit of \$10 per ton on iron by limiting her output to one-half of our consumptive demands she can make twice as much clear

money as she would make on \$2.50 per ton profit and supply our full demand.

Iron ore prepared for the furnace when it leaves labor's hands, coal prepared for the furnace when it leaves labor's hands, are very cheap; in fact, as cheap in the United States, and especially in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Alabama, as any place in Europe. The keeping up of the tariff affects not the price of labor, but enables corporate wealth and the greed of monopoly to gobble up the shekels and oppress the people. In Pennsylvania during the census year there was mined all the anthracite coal and eighteen and a quarter of the fifty-two million dollars' worth of bituminous coal mined in the United States. Of all the coal mined, 44 per cent. in value was anthracite and 56 per cent. was bituminous. Pennsylvania mined all the anthracite and more than one-third of the bituminous coal. Taking all in all, she mined 64 per cent., while the balance of the country mined 36 per cent. only. Iowa mined two and a half million dollars' worth of the fifty-two millions' worth. In Pennsylvania the coal when mined was worth 96 cents per ton, and labor cost paid for mining was only 61 cents per ton, while in Iowa the coal was worth \$1.70, and the labor cost was higher than in Pennsylvania.

Of all the bituminous coal turned out in the United States during the census year, Pennsylvania turned out 43 per cent. in quantity, but in value only 35 per cent.; while Iowa turned out only 3.4 per cent. in quantity, but 4.7 per cent. in value, and notwithstanding the higher price of coal in Iowa in quality it was inferior to the Pennsylvania coal.

I apprehend that my good friends from Pennsylvania will hardly admit that wages are so much higher in Iowa as to justify this difference in the price of coal.

COTTON GOODS.

Let us next take up the cotton goods business.

In the cotton goods business, if we are to accept the statistics found in volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1124, 1125, 1126, and 1127, out of every \$100 worth of goods, the materials, most all of which was cotton—

Cost.....	\$54.40
The operative labor.....	21.60
Making a total.....	76.00
The balance.....	24.00
went to capital. Now, what do you want to protect? If only the \$21.60, there is very little difference in the price of labor between the United States and England in the cotton goods business. But be liberal; say we pay \$1 where they pay 75 cents. That being the case—	
They would have paid.....	\$16.20
While we paid.....	21.60
A difference of.....	5.40

This \$100 worth of goods would therefore have cost..... \$94.60
But the unit of value is..... 100.00

Difference..... 5.40

If they make \$94.60 while we make \$100, then they would make \$100 while we would make \$105.70. Hence the amount, \$5.70 on \$100 worth of their goods, makes the difference, and 10 per cent. ad valorem duty is more than enough.

Next, take woolen goods. Turn to pages 1190 to 1201, both inclusive, volume 2 Census, and there we find a detailed statement covering 1,990 woolen-mills in the United States, that turned out more than \$160,000,000 worth of goods. A careful analysis of the cost shows that out of every \$100 worth of goods they cost—

Foreign and domestic wool.....	\$41.16
Hair, noils, etc.....	37
Cotton and cotton yarn.....	6.57
Woolen and worsted yarn.....	2.45
Chemicals.....	2.90
Wood and coal.....	1.09
All other material.....	4.00

Total cost of material.....	58.54
Paid wages to employes.....	15.79

Total cost.....	74.33
Balance to capital.....	25.67

Total value of product..... 100.00

Now, if wool is to go on the free-list, that, it is to be presumed, will cheapen it. Some say it will be higher. At any rate, we can buy from the same market that England and Europe buy from. For my own part, I feel that it will be cheapened. Let us now go over the items, and instead of \$41.16 say it costs \$35. The next item, though small, is as cheap with us as anybody, because admitted free of duty. The next three items, except for the little dab of labor in them, are as cheap with us as with any one. In their unfinished condition there is but little labor in them at most; but be liberal, take out \$1.50 and there will be left \$13.42. The wood and coal, I take it, are as cheap here as any place, \$1.09. The other materials, I do not know what they are, but they are in a crude state and have but little labor about them; take out, however, 15 per cent. or 60 cents in the \$4 worth, leaving \$3.40, making for material \$53.28; now, labor, \$1.50, and 60 cents, \$2.10, deducted above, added to the original \$15.79 of labor cost, making total labor cost needing protection, \$17.89; and this makes the cost of materials and labor \$69.07, instead of \$74.33 as before. Now add to this \$69.07 the \$25.67 to capital, and we have \$94.74.

Thus by the cheapening process we have \$94.74 instead of \$100. In that \$94.74 there is \$17.89 of labor. If there be \$17.89 to protect in \$94.74 there would be \$18.88 to be protected in \$100. But suppose instead of \$18.88 we say \$20 to make it round figures. Now, say we pay \$1, while England pays 66½ cents, then we would pay \$20 while England would pay \$13.33½, difference \$6.66½. Protect this difference and the \$5.70 difference in cotton goods, which would more than be covered by a 10 per cent. ad valorem duty! Then why make the ad valorem duty 30 and 40 per cent. and thus place it in the power of our manufacturers to combine and run up prices?

For the purpose of showing the labor cost in the manufacture of different articles I have prepared a table which I desire shall be marked Table C and made a supplement to my speech. This table I have prepared wholly from information drawn from volume 2 of our Census Compendium, 1880, pages 932-933, etc.

When armed with the capital and materials the cost of labor is not the big item, but is generally comparatively small. By reference to Table C it will be seen that the labor on \$100 worth of—

Flour.....	Cost.	\$3.40
Refined sugar.....	1.80	
Chemicals.....	10.00	
Drugs and chemicals.....	10.80	
Cheese and butter.....	6.00	
Ground coffee, spices, etc.....	6.00	
Starch.....	12.20	
Tanned leather.....	8.10	
Curried leather.....	6.70	
Dressed skins.....	15.80	
Boots and shoes.....	25.90	
Saddles and harness.....	21.00	
Lumber, sawed.....	13.60	
Lumber, planed.....	16.00	
Pig-iron.....	14.10	
Bessemer steel.....	8.60	

TABLE C.

Kind of industry.	Average number of employes.	Aggregate value of products.	Amount of wages paid.	Paid to wages.	Per ct.
Blast-furnaces.....	41,875	\$99,315,569	\$12,680,702		14.1
Bloomers and forges.....	2,939	3,968,074	915,395		23.0
Rolling-mills.....	80,133	136,798,574	34,004,799		24.3
Bessemer, etc.....	10,835	55,805,210	4,930,349		8.6
Crucible and miscellaneous.....	5,196	10,670,258	2,945,539		27.6
Total and average.....	140,978	296,557,688	55,476,784		18.6
Cotton goods.....	172,544	192,090,110	42,040,510		21.8
Woolen goods.....	86,504	163,665,337	25,836,392		15.7
Mixed textiles.....	43,373	66,221,703	13,316,753		20.1
Dyeing and mixed textiles.....	16,698	32,297,420	6,474,364		20.0
Paper.....	24,422	55,109,914	8,525,355		15.4
Chemicals.....	29,520	117,377,324	11,840,704		10.0
Felt goods.....	1,524	3,877,736	439,786		11.3
Leather, tanned.....	23,812	113,348,336	9,204,243		8.1
Leather, curried.....	11,053	71,351,297	4,845,413		6.7
Leather, dressed skins.....	5,395	15,399,311	2,441,372		15.8
Leather goods.....	1,038	2,020,343	439,318		22.7
Boots and shoes.....	111,052	166,050,354	43,001,438		25.9
Saddles and harness.....	21,446	38,081,643	7,997,752		21.0
Lumber, sawed.....	147,956	233,268,729	31,845,974		13.6
Lumber, planed.....	15,269	36,803,956	5,800,724		16.0
Sash, doors, and blinds.....	21,898	36,621,325	8,540,930		23.3
Wood, turned and carved.....	5,638	6,770,119	2,148,914		31.5
Plumbing and gas-fitting.....	9,684	18,133,250	4,770,389		26.3
Patent medicines.....	4,025	14,682,494	1,651,596		11.6
Photographing.....	3,977	5,938,311	1,751,118		29.0
Sugar-refining.....	5,837	155,438,915	2,875,032		1.8
Sewing-machines.....	11,375	15,928,085	3,519,437		33.4
Steel springs, cars and carriages.....	1,530	8,634,862	699,412		19.0
Starch.....	3,119	7,477,742	919,197		12.2
Foundries and machine-shops.....	145,337	214,378,468	65,982,132		30.7
Roofing, etc.....	3,082	6,227,294	1,411,133		22.6
Smelting and roasting and brass scrap metals.....	311	8,411,100	158,300		1.8
Salt.....	4,289	4,829,596	1,260,023		26.0
Coal, bituminous.....	100,116	5,260,146	32,601,460		62.2
Coal, anthracite.....	70,748	42,139,740	22,693,407		53.9
Ore, iron.....	31,668	20,470,756	9,538,117		46.6
Ore, copper.....	6,258	8,896,245	\$3,214,031		36.2
Agricultural implements.....	33,580	68,640,486	15,359,610		22.3
Carriages and wagons.....	45,394	64,951,617	18,988,515		29.7
Carriage and wagon materials.....	7,502	10,114,352	2,733,004		27.0
Awnings and tents.....	1,268	1,968,942	334,465		17.0
Boxes (wooden for packing).....	7,822	43,374,271	11,726,001		27.4
Brass and copper goods.....	12,461	26,661,571	7,663,292		28.7
Brick and tile.....	66,355	32,833,587	13,443,532		40.9
Cars, railroad and street.....	14,232	27,997,591	5,507,713		19.0
Charcoal.....	1,401	975,540	390,697		41.0
Cheese and butter.....	7,986	25,742,270	1,546,495		6.0
Clocks, watches, and watch-cases.....	11,052	15,034,839	5,279,056		35.1
Coffee, spices (roast and ground).....	2,716	22,924,894	1,370,698		6.0
Coffins and burial-cases.....	4,415	8,157,760	1,895,805		23.2
Cooperage.....	25,973	33,714,770	8,992,693		26.6
Copper-smithing.....	9,868	2,087,773	520,302		25.0
Drugs and chemicals.....	9,545	38,173,658	4,157,163		10.8
Flouring and grist-mills.....	53,407	505,185,712	17,422,316		3.4
Fruit and vegetable canning and preserves.....	31,905	17,599,576	2,679,960		15.2
Furniture and upholstering.....	52,087	75,196,795	21,737,128		28.9
Chairs.....	10,575	9,807,823	3,311,286		33.7
Handles (wooden).....	1,575	1,656,698	486,664		29.3

I have not pretended to run clear through the list, but any person who may feel an interest in the matter, and who is familiar with the fundamental rules, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, and the time-honored rule of three, can easily extend it through the entire list.

The sensible man strikes more fools on the subject of wages than upon any other question extant. If gentlemen instead of continually harping on the difference in the per diem wages paid in this country and in Europe would compare the results of labor more, and would compare the per diem wages paid in the different States of this Union more, and in the different parts of the same State and often in different parts of the same Congressional district more, they might arrive at more correct conclusions as to why labor commands a better price at one place than another.

Some two months ago I had a constituent, a clever fellow and on most subjects very intelligent. He is interested in mining and shipping kaoline to Philadelphia, 800 miles distant, and I may say he has a most excellent plant when once rightly developed with all necessary conveniences.

He got scared about the tariff and came on here to exert his influence against any reductions. He called on me; I sympathized with him; was anxious to assist him. The duty reduced on kaoline or the products of kaoline would ruin him. He prepared at some trouble and expense to himself an argument on the price of wages—days' wages—between this country and Europe, seeming to forget altogether the fact that the question of labor was a mere song, that it was his distance from the railroad, that he had to team it over bad, rough roads with wagons and then pay high freights, twice as much as fair freightage ought to be, over railroads a distance of more than 800 miles. In further illustration of the wage question, I have prepared three tables which I shall mark D, E, and F, and make parts of my remarks.

The first of the three, being the one numbered D, prepared from facts found in volume 2, Compendium Census, beginning on page 944 and ending on page 1029, shows the average number of our manufacturing people at work in each of the States, the aggregate amount of wages paid, the average per employé per year, and the ratio of wages. Beginning with California, where wages are highest, and making the amount paid there the unit of comparison, and running on down to North Carolina, where wages are lowest, I find Pennsylvania away down eleventh in the list, paying \$71.78, while California pays \$100, New York \$94.90, and down to North Carolina, where \$31.10 settles the bill.

The second of these three tables, the one numbered E, prepared from facts found in volume 2, Compendium Census, beginning on page 1030 and ending with page 1095, shows the average number of our manufacturing people at work in each of the several cities named, the aggregate amount of wages paid, the average per employé per year, and the ratio of wages. Taking New York as a unit of comparison and running on down to Baltimore, where wages are lowest, I find Philadelphia, out of the thirteen cities considered, standing No. 10, occupying a column one nearer the top, but relatively several nearer the bottom than that in which Pennsylvania was found in the column of States. While New York pays \$100, San Francisco \$122.95, Chicago \$102.12, and St. Louis \$99.29, poor Philadelphia pays only \$81.03.

But lest my distinguished friends from the Second, Third, and Fourth districts of Pennsylvania, who have been sent here to keep the yoke upon my constituents, for a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary; for long years living in the past, coming from a city evidently living in the past—lest they should think there was some thing wrong about all these calculations, I have prepared a third table, marked F, from volume 2, Compendium Census, on pages 1070 and 1076 respectively, showing the average number of people engaged in certain manufacturing industries in New York City, and in the same industries in Philadelphia, the aggregate wages paid in each branch of industry, the average per employé, and the ratio to the employés in the respective cities. Taking the price paid in New York as the unit of comparison, and I find that in Philadelphia wages range all the way from 47 to 87 cents, while \$1 is demanded and paid in New York.

Now, sirs, at the time the census whose figures are used was taken Philadelphia had 185,527 persons engaged in the manufacturing industries of the city, out of a population of 847,170. New York had only 227,352 persons engaged in manufacturing industries, out of a population of 1,206,299. To have had as large a proportion of her population engaged in the manufacturing industries as Philadelphia, New York would have had to have 264,000 persons engaged in such industries, or 37,000 more than she did have; Chicago, instead of 79,414, would have had to have 110,000; St. Louis, instead of 41,825, would have had to have 76,000; San Francisco, instead of 23,442, would have had to have 51,000. This shows that Philadelphia was more of a manufacturing city than New York, Chicago, St. Louis, or San Francisco, and if high wages depend on a larger per cent. of population being engaged in manufacturing industries, why is it that wages are not higher in Philadelphia than in New York or these other cities? And if the competition of cheap labor breaks down and destroys high-priced labor, how is it that the 227,000 persons engaged in the manufacturing industries in

New York are not driven from their business by the cheap pauper labor of Philadelphia?

The pauper labor of Europe in an open field destroying the high-priced labor of America! The pauper labor of Philadelphia destroying the high-priced labor in New York! Was anything ever more farcical? I invite my friends from New York to contemplate the scene. And I pause to say to my friends from Philadelphia, Uncle Charlie in particular, "If you have tears to shed, prepare to shed them now."

Our protectionist friends talk with exultation at our growth as a country (my distinguished colleague [Mr. BROWNE] calls it "phenomenal") and of our high-priced labor, attributing it all to the tariff; and shed erocodile tears lest it should be brought into competition with the pauper labor of Europe. Does not every well-informed man know that high-priced labor beats the world in an open field? It always has and always will.

Our country's greatness! What made it great? The tariff. Who built these magnificent monuments? The tariff. What enables us to grow such splendid corn? The tariff. How is it that Kentucky has such fine horses? The tariff. How is it that we have these fertile lands, this healthful climate, these intelligent people, the good sunshine, and the rainfall? The tariff. How is it that now and then we cull out a holiday and call it the Fourth of July? The tariff, of course.

I once heard of an old physician who had a student whom he was trying to bring up in the ways of a full-fledged Esculapian. He had a sick patient to visit. He took his pupil with him; they entered the patient's bed-room; the old doctor felt the patient's pulse, looked about, and said to the patient: "You have been eating eggs, haven't you?" "Yes," said the patient. The old doctor prescribed, and they left. On the way back the pupil asked: "How did you know he had been eating eggs?" "Because," responded the old gentleman, "I saw the shells under the bed." Another day passed and the old doctor sent the young man to see the patient. The young man went in, felt the patient's pulse, looked about, prescribed, and returned. When he gets back the old doctor asks him: "Well, how is Mr. Brown to-day?" "I don't know, but I am afraid he is going to die!" "Going to die! Why do you think so?" "Because he has eat a horse." "Eat a horse! Why, what makes you think he has eat a horse?" "Because I saw the saddle and harness under the bed."

Because our country has prospered our protectionist friends look around, and finding the tariff in sight, they gladly attribute our growth and prosperity to the tariff. Sirs, the tariff has handicapped our people; it has built up millionaires, created colossal fortunes. In doing so it has ground and oppressed the people, transferred the money from the pockets of the many to the pockets of the few.

Why, Mr. Chairman, away back in 1860 I remember hearing Henry S. Lane deliver a speech at Bloomfield, a town in my district. He and Thomas A. Hendricks were opposing candidates for governor. Hendricks dwelt with just pride on the rapid stride our country was making in the march of progress under Democratic rule. Lane replied, admitting that it had, but wondered if the sunshine, the equitable rainfall, the healthfulness of our climate, the fertility of our soil, the intelligence of our people, in short, the greatness of our opportunities, did not have something to do with it.

During the decade then just passed all former decades were badly left, just as every ten years are bound to surpass every preceding ten years. The rule of progress, sirs, is upon the law of geometrical progression, and not the law of arithmetical progression, 1 and 1 are 2, and 1 are 3, and 1 are 4, and so on; 2 and 2 are 4, and 2 are 6, and 2 are 8, and so on, arithmetical progression; 2 and 2 are 4, and 4 are 8, and 8 are 16, and so on, geometrical progression. Simple interest never compounded is arithmetical progression. Compounded and it is geometrical progression. One hundred dollars at 8 per cent. interest draws \$8 per year, or \$800 in a hundred years. But at 8 per cent. compounded and in less than ten years it doubles itself. In ten years it is \$200; in twenty years, \$400; in thirty years, \$800; in forty, \$1,600; in fifty, \$3,200; in sixty, \$6,400; in seventy, \$12,800; in eighty, \$25,600; in ninety, \$51,200, and in one hundred years it is \$102,400, or \$101,500 more than by the simple way. In 1850 we had over seven billions of property, and in 1860 a little over sixteen billions.

For every \$100 in 1850 we had \$226 in 1860. This rate of increase would have given us a little over thirty-six billions in 1870 and a little over eighty-two billions in 1880. Instead, we had only thirty billions in 1870 and forty-three billions in 1880.

In 1850 we had 9,021 miles of railroad; in 1860 we had 30,635. For every 100 miles we had in 1850 we had 339½ in 1860. The same rate of increase would have given us over 104,000 miles in 1870 and over 356,000 miles in 1880. Instead, in 1870 we had 52,914, and in 1880 93,349. In all the essential elements of advancement the country never prospered like it did between 1850 and 1860. In the language of Henry S. Lane, wages are good; our country's prosperity is phenomenal. Our wide fields and room for diversification, our genial sunshine, our refreshing rainfalls, our winters and our summers, our seed-time and our harvest, our intelligence, our virtues, our good government, our grand opportunities make wages good and make our country prosper.

Although considerable of a skeptic, not much given to believe in that which I can not hear, see, taste, feel, or smell, or deduce by an *a priori* course of reasoning from something that I can hear, see, taste, feel, or smell, I am disposed to give God the glory, and to sing:

Rise, shine, give God the glory,
Rise, shine, give God the glory,
Rise, shine, give God the glory,
In the year of jubilee.

TABLE D.

Name of State.	Average number of employes in the manufacturing industries.	Aggregate amount paid in wages.	Average amount per year per employe.	Ratio of wages paid.
1 California	43,693	\$21,065,905	\$482	100.00
2 Colorado	5,074	2,314,427	455	94.40
3 Minnesota	21,247	8,613,094	405	84.01
4 Connecticut	112,915	43,501,518	386	80.08
5 Missouri	63,995	24,309,716	380	78.83
6 New York	531,533	198,634,029	375	77.80
7 Illinois	154,724	57,429,085	371	76.97
8 Nebraska	4,783	1,742,311	364	75.51
9 Delaware	12,638	4,267,349	361	74.89
10 Louisiana	12,167	4,360,371	358	74.26
11 New Jersey	126,038	46,083,045	350	72.61
12 Pennsylvania	387,072	134,055,904	345	71.78
13 Rhode Island	62,826	21,355,619	340	70.50
14 Ohio	183,609	62,103,800	338	70.10
15 Massachusetts	352,255	128,315,362	326	67.40
16 Wisconsin	57,109	18,814,917	330	68.30
17 Kansas	12,062	3,995,010	322	66.80
18 Michigan	77,591	25,313,094	326	67.56
19 Iowa	30,372	9,725,962	320	66.30
20 Kentucky	37,391	11,657,844	318	66.00
21 Indiana	69,508	21,960,888	315	65.30
22 New Hampshire	48,831	14,814,793	303	62.80
23 West Virginia	14,311	4,313,965	300	62.20
24 Vermont	17,540	5,164,479	294	61.00
25 Texas	12,159	3,343,087	275	59.00
26 Maryland	74,945	18,904,965	265	55.00
27 Maine	52,954	13,623,318	257	53.30
28 Alabama	10,019	2,500,504	249	52.00
29 Tennessee	22,445	5,254,775	235	48.00
30 Florida	5,504	1,270,875	230	47.70
31 Arkansas	4,557	925,358	230	47.70
32 Georgia	24,875	5,266,152	212	44.00
33 Mississippi	5,827	1,192,645	205	42.50
34 Virginia	40,184	7,425,261	185	38.30
35 South Carolina	15,828	2,836,289	180	37.30
36 North Carolina	18,109	2,740,768	150	31.10

TABLE E.

Name of city.	Average number of employes in the manufacturing industries.	Aggregate amount paid in wages to all employes.	Average amount per employe per year.	Ratio of wages paid.
1 New York	227,352	\$97,030,021	\$427	100.00
2 San Francisco	28,442	14,928,534	525	122.95
3 Chicago	79,414	34,653,462	436	102.12
4 St. Louis	41,825	17,743,532	424	99.29
5 Boston	59,213	24,924,009	420	98.36
6 Providence	22,891	9,464,110	413	96.72
7 Cleveland	21,724	8,502,935	391	91.33
8 Detroit	16,110	6,306,460	391	91.33
9 New Orleans	9,504	3,717,577	390	91.33
10 Philadelphia	185,527	64,265,966	346	81.03
11 Louisville	17,448	5,835,545	333	78.00
12 Milwaukee	20,886	6,946,005	332	78.00
13 Baltimore	56,338	15,177,489	270	63.23

TABLE F.

Kind of industry, manufacturing.	Average number employes in certain manufacturing industries.	Amount of wages paid.	Average wages.	Ratio of wages.
1 Artificial flowers and feathers, New York	3,498	\$934,768	\$267.00	1.00
1 Artificial flowers and feathers, Philadelphia	382	65,330	171.00	.64
2 Awnings and artificial tents, New York	203	74,212	365.00	1.00
2 Awnings and artificial tents, Philadelphia	140	25,964	185.00	.50
3 Paper bags, New York	218	74,709	342.00	1.00
3 Paper bags, Philadelphia	363	94,530	260.00	.76
4 Paper and other bags, New York	747	317,850	425.00	1.00
4 Paper and other bags, Philadelphia	152	40,215	264.00	.61
5 Blacksmithing, New York	569	367,459	646.00	1.00
5 Blacksmithing, Philadelphia	634	299,259	472.00	.73
6 Fancy and paper boxes, New York	2,355	671,620	285.00	1.00
6 Fancy and paper boxes, Philadelphia	1,435	263,216	180.00	.63

TABLE F—Continued.

Kind of industry, manufacturing.	Average number employes in certain manufacturing industries.	Amount of wages paid.	Average wages.	Ratio of wages.
7 Baskets, rattan and willow-ware, New York	\$106	\$35,715	\$337.00	1.00
7 Baskets, rattan and willowware, Philadelphia	42	7,154	170.00	.50
8 Belting, hose and leather, New York	257	150,694	586.00	1.00
8 Belting, hose and leather, Philadelphia	80	41,165	518.00	.87
9 Blacking, New York	86	56,500	657.00	1.00
9 Blacking, Philadelphia	144	44,480	309.00	.47
10 Boots and shoes, New York	5,587	2,474,050	423.00	1.00
10 Boots and shoes, Philadelphia	7,535	2,788,409	370.00	.86
11 Boxes, wooden packing, New York	515	305,682	595.00	1.00
11 Boxes, wooden packing, Philadelphia	427	169,990	398.00	.67
12 Carriages and wagons, New York	1,602	965,719	602.00	1.00
12 Carriages and wagons, Philadelphia	1,578	767,834	486.00	.80
13 Men's clothing, New York	47,647	14,012,805	294.00	1.00
13 Men's clothing, Philadelphia	17,666	4,085,239	231.00	.80
14 Women's clothing, New York	12,366	3,886,715	314.00	1.00
14 Women's clothing, Philadelphia	2,656	479,436	180.00	.57

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Republican and Democratic parties on the subject of the tariff is radical, fundamental, irreconcilable. It is not a mere question as to the adjustment of a schedule of duties on foreign importations under a well-established governmental policy, but a question as to the policy itself. If it were a mere question of adjustment it could and should be removed from the domain of party politics to that of business, and be settled with reference to the demands of the revenue and of the business of the country for the time being. The everchanging conditions of trade and commerce and of industrial production necessarily require from time to time a readjustment of these duties, in order to promote and enforce the policy under which they are laid, and such adjustment should be left to the wisdom of Congress, unembarrassed by party strife.

But the question here is one of governmental policy, and is this: Shall duties be laid for the purpose of revenue only or shall they be laid not only for the purpose of revenue, but also with a direct view to the encouragement of home industries and home labor? If the policy be settled in favor of protection, then the matter of adjustment becomes a question of business to be settled by such mutual concessions between conflicting industries and interests as will best promote the good of the whole people, in effecting which every man may think and act free from the trammels of party. But if it be settled in favor of a tariff for revenue only, the only question of adjustment which can then arise will be as to what articles of foreign importation when subjected to tariff duties will best produce the revenue necessary for the maintenance of the Government without any reference to how home industries and home labor will be affected.

It is the avowed policy of the Democratic party to reduce tariff duties to the revenue basis, and the bill under consideration is brought in with that view. Indeed, I go further and charge that it is not only their purpose to bring tariff duties to the revenue basis, but to eliminate entirely from our revenue policy the idea of protection to American industries and American labor. The Democratic party is absolutely hostile to the protection idea, as is manifest by the last message of the President of the United States to Congress, and from the utterances of the leaders of the party on the floor of this House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] said the other day:

From Texas [Mr. MILLS] said the other day: We should levy taxes to obtain revenue, but not to restrict importations—

And that—

we will increase wealth if we lower the duties and let importations come in of those things which can be produced cheaper in other countries than our own.

This is the true Democratic faith as taught and practiced by the Southern Democracy, and was inspired not only by their selfish interests as slave-owners and cotton-growers, but by their peculiar construction of the Constitution of the United States. When the Constitution was adopted the people at once divided upon the question of its true construction; one party insisting that it created a government for the people of the thirteen original States sovereign within its sphere, and that in determining the extent and limit of its powers the Constitution should receive a fair and reasonable construction; a construction that would give it effect not only according to its letter, but its spirit; a construction that would imply all powers necessary to the due exercise of those expressly granted; in short, a construction which regarded the people of these States as constituting a nation and the Constitution as creating a government for them, whose sovereignty was paramount to that of the States.

But the other party insisted upon a strict construction, a construction which assumed for its basis that the Constitution created a mere agency for the convenience of confederated but sovereign States, and that it

possessed only such powers as were expressly given to it. This party, which afterwards became the Democratic party, founded all its doctrines and policies upon the dogma of strict construction, and denied to the General Government the most essential powers of government, even the right of self-preservation, because no express warrant therefor could be found in the Constitution. Upon this ground it denied the power to establish a national bank, to undertake or carry on internal improvements, to acquire foreign territory, and especially the right to lay duties for the purpose of protecting home industries, and whenever the tariff has been under discussion in Congress the question of the constitutionality of protection has been raised by the Democratic membership, and is raised to-day, notwithstanding one hundred years of Congressional legislation recognizing it.

So that a tariff for revenue in the light of history and as expounded by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, means the absolute destruction of the policy of protection. And if internal-revenue taxes are retained, as proposed by this bill, the additional amount of revenue necessary for the maintenance of the Government can be obtained from duties so laid as to avoid even accidental or incidental protection—that species of protection which the Democratic party has heretofore expressed a willingness to submit to for the sake of the revenue. It is possible to select articles not produced here (as in free-trade England, where they levy duties on tea and coffee) from which this additional revenue may be obtained, and who can doubt, in view of the utterances on the other side of the House in the course of this debate, that even this species of protection will be eliminated from our tariff policy if the Democratic party obtains full and complete control of the Government?

Are we prepared for a tariff for revenue only as thus understood? What will it mean to the industries of this country? I will tell you. It will mean a readjustment of the industrial system of this country on the basis of unprotected competition with the industrial systems of the whole world; it will mean that in order to hold our own market—a market in which we sell at good prices 90 per cent. of our immense production—our labor must come down to the European standard and accept the wages and adopt the methods of living of the laborers of England and Germany; it will mean that many of our industries must fail utterly and their men be turned out to crowd the labor market of the remaining industries, bringing wages still lower, or, unfitted by training and experience, to enter the field of agriculture, there to assist in swelling the surplus of unmarketable production, or else wander as tramps through the country. And it will mean in its ultimate manifestation danger to the peace and safety of the Republic.

Gentlemen on the other side talk glibly about our labor being able to compete successfully with that of any other country and promise us the foreign market as compensation for any impairment of the home market. Undoubtedly the American workingman in point of intelligence, energy, and industry has no superior on earth, and with anything like equal conditions would fear no competition, but the free-trader, fair-trader, tariff-for-revenue reformer, or whatever else he may call himself, refuses to see that the conditions are not equal and can not be made so except by bringing our standard of labor and living down to that of other countries. What are the conditions under which we must enter upon the competition involved in the policy of a tariff for revenue only? First, what is our condition? We have a population of about sixty million souls—at the last census 50,597,057—but there are only seventeen persons for each square mile of our territory. Our exports last year amounted to \$703,022,923, while our imports reached the sum of but \$692,319,768, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of \$10,703,155, and this does not include the imports and exports of gold and silver bullion and specie upon which the balance of trade was also in our favor to the amount of \$37,460,492.

Ever since and including the year 1874 the balance of trade has been very largely in our favor. Last year we exported wheat, wheat flour, and corn to the amount of \$162,013,864, and the only grain imported was barley, to the amount of \$6,568,833. Our exports to Great Britain were of the value of \$363,101,143, while our imports from that country were only of the value of \$165,067,463, being a balance against free-trade England of \$198,033,680. Our debt on the first day of this month less cash in the Treasury was \$1,181,632,855, but our income last year was \$371,403,277 as against an expenditure of \$267,932,180, leaving a balance of \$103,471,097 applicable to the payment of this debt, of which \$47,903,248 was so applied by the purchase of bonds for the sinking fund, and the remainder might well have been applied to the purchase of outstanding bonds of the Government but for the political necessity of maintaining a surplus, in order to pave the way for tariff reduction.

The pretense of doubt about authority under existing law to purchase bonds having served its purpose, and Congress, to relieve the President from embarrassment, having by resolution expressed the opinion that the law of 1881 means just what it says, we may hope to see the accumulating surplus hereafter applied to the extinguishment of the debt. These are conditions of prosperity and offer opportunities to the citizen of independence, of comfort, of leisure, for intellectual growth and development not to be periled by a radical change of policy, the result of which must be purely speculative, and which in any event will bring disturbance and distress to our industrial and business interests

during the process of change from the old to the new basis. Surely it is a case, if there ever was one, where it is "better to let well enough alone."

But what are the industrial conditions in other lands, whose unrestricted competition we invite? Turn to Europe; there we find the land crowded with human beings, from two hundred to five hundred to the square mile, an average to the square mile of over two hundred persons, who scramble and push each other in the struggle for bread, whose lives are given over to the single effort to obtain the mere means of existence, and who have no part or lot in making or executing the laws under which they live. I speak of the great mass of the people, the common people, those who really bear the heavy burdens of European government, who support in idleness its great standing armies and the magnificence of its nobility and royalty. England is perhaps less extravagant in this respect than others, and yet she pays nearly \$100,000,000 a year for her army and her royal family. The annuities to the royal family amount to \$2,715,000, the keeping of the royal palaces to \$199,910, and the expenditure of the army to \$91,969,500, making a total of \$94,884,410. The strength of the standing armies of the leading States of Europe is as follows, namely:

	Men.		Men.
Austria	267,179	Holland	53,000
Belgium	54,818	Portugal	32,000
Denmark	16,653	Spain	144,664
France	525,711	Russia	735,218
Germany	492,000		
Great Britain	149,391	Total	2,753,521
Italy	265,389		

Each of these countries has a debt per head of its population greater than the United States, except Italy—the debt per head ranging from \$28 to \$153—and in all but Austria, Germany, and Russia their imports largely exceed their exports, and especially is this true of grain and flour; and in all except France, Germany, and Great Britain the annual governmental expenditure is greater than the income. In France, Germany, and Great Britain there is often a deficit, and the expenses of government are only met by the most onerous systems of taxation imaginable. Everything is taxed; in addition to the ordinary subjects of taxation in all countries, they tax doors, windows, railway passengers, licenses, carriages, male servants, and many things which display an ingenuity in finding subjects of taxation that only the most pressing necessity could inspire. The consolidated debt of France amounts to the enormous sum of \$4,745,619,245, and that of Great Britain to \$3,631,393,440.

These are not conditions of prosperity, not conditions conducive to high or even fair wages for labor and the beneficent results incident thereto; and yet it is proposed to bring our labor to the standard of these tax-ridden, overcrowded, ignorant populations. This bill is to be the beginning of that end. It is but a short step from this bill to the revenue basis, and the proposition is plain, if not self-evident, that free competition with these peoples means acceptance of their standards. We have no longer even the advantage which distance from the field of their production formerly afforded us. The cost and delay of transportation which distance imposed has been so lessened by the railroad, the steam-ship, the telegraph, and ocean cable, that there is now practically no restriction upon competition between the two continents save that imposed by legislation, and to legislation we must look as the only efficient means of equalizing conditions or preventing injurious competition. And looking to the good of our people as the best way of working out our part in the great plan of human progress, we have heretofore so legislated, with reference to the conditions attending our national development, as to prevent hurtful competitions, and we must continue to do so unless we are willing to become mere hewers of wood and drawers of water for some better-equipped rival.

If there could be substantial equality of conditions, then free and unrestricted commerce would be possible, and would follow as effect follows cause. But if the nations are to be brought to substantial equality in this respect, the movement should be upward and not downward, forward and not backward, up from the low wages of pauper labor to the fair wages of independent, self-respecting, intelligent labor.

If the restrictions we have placed upon foreign commerce for the protection of our industries and our labor be removed, will the movement be upward or downward? The crowded millions of Europe are standing by the shores of the Atlantic, with a surplus of everything but food, waiting to throw their wares upon our rich market and realize returns that will bring to them plentier and cheaper food and the comforts which their poverty has heretofore denied them, and they will win the market; as the cheapest producers they will take possession of our market and hold it, unless we cheapen our productions to their standard.

It is a question of labor, of cheap labor—the cheapest labor must win if the productions be of substantially equal value. It is hardly possible to conceive of anything having value and which may be made the subject of traffic and commerce, which is not enhanced in value by labor, and must have the stamp of labor upon it before it can be devoted to the use of man. Gold is of no value until drawn by the hand of labor from its hiding place in the earth or released from the slow-yielding grasp of the quartz—and so with all things; they must be consecrated to use by the hand of labor. And so it is, that whatever the

other advantages of a competitor, the element of labor is the controlling one, and the market will yield to the cheaper labor, the production being substantially as good as the competing one. It is only necessary to state this, it needs no elaboration or argument.

But it is said that the increased demand for our agricultural production will compensate for any injury to our manufactures. Necessarily the crippling of our manufactures will cheapen agricultural production, both by crippling the consuming power of the people and by the increased production which the return of the factory hand to the field will involve, and this cheapening and the introduction of foreign goods may increase the demand for wheat, corn, etc., but through the lowering of prices will benefit us but little, if at all. In the end we must accept European conditions and cheapen our labor so as to hold our market, or in large measure surrender commercial and industrial independence and devote ourselves to feeding the factories of Europe. Either way, we must lose our place in the great movement for the development of the earth's resources and the uplifting of its peoples, with which diversified industry has illustrated this age, and become mere stragglers in the rear of the procession.

Why should we voluntarily and unnecessarily embarrass ourselves in this race of life? We should lead the procession. Our area is continental; every variety of soil and climate is embraced within our boundaries. The lakes on the North, the gulf on the South, the great oceans on either hand, and the mighty rivers of the interior, supplemented with 150,000 miles of railway, afford facilities for transportation unequalled in all the world. Timber, coal, iron, and every production of forest, field, and mine necessary to the development of the highest civilization are here at the command of intelligent industry; and it is only necessary to avail ourselves of these advantages, it is only necessary to seize and improve the great opportunities which they afford in order to become the richest and most powerful nation of the world. Why, then, should we go to and depend on any other country for the things necessary for our national life and progress? And why, especially, should we go to them for the things we can produce ourselves? In order that we may get them cheaper, and in order that we may escape the clutch of monopolies, says the free-trader. But the answer to this is one approved by a hundred years of national experience, and is this: That home competition, the competition between our own producers and manufacturers, will insure reasonable prices to the consumer—much lower prices than would be accepted by the foreigner if in control of our market.

There has been a constant and rapid cheapening to the consumer of all productions since the beginning of our national existence, but more especially so since the enactment of the protective tariff of 1861. I will not offer tables of statistics to prove this; already the RECORD groans with figures that prove it beyond question. And in truth it is not questioned. The free-trader does not question the fact, but will attribute it to any cause under the sun rather than the protective tariff. Yet it is a fact that can not be controverted that in every leading industry home competition has brought down the price, and the lowering of the price dates from the laying of the first protective duty on the foreign article. It was so of steel rails, as often instanced, and of spool cotton, silks, woollens, blankets, etc. The country is too broad, its interests too varied, the enterprise of its people too great ever to become the helpless prey of monopoly.

There is a tendency, it is true, to combination on the part of capital through corporate organization, trusts, and what not, that is antagonistic to the welfare and happiness of the people which, while not growing out of, are made possible by the modern facilities for rapid communication and transportation. These agencies make possible the great combinations of capital which center in New York, London, and other great cities, and thence reach out to the whole world demanding tribute. They are not confined to any one country; they rise above all tariffs, whether protective or for revenue only, and exist wherever capital is found, and greed of gain and unscrupulousness combine with opportunity. It will not be claimed that a protective tariff gave rise to the Standard Oil combination, nor that a tariff for revenue only is responsible for the great English combinations of capital which exist to-day, nor that the revenue policy of France is responsible for the recent French copper syndicate. The tendency grows out of the peculiar commercial and business conditions of the age and these combinations must be met by legislation aimed at them directly, and of a character that will restrain the abuses of which they are guilty, and surely this end can better be attained by a study of the extent and character of their operations and the true and real causes of their existence than by an outcry against the tariff upon the demagogic assumption that it is responsible for them.

The tendency of the age is to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few at the expense of the many, and largely grows out of the abuse of corporate organization and power. These abuses call for radical measures, and unless the great corporations of the day are brought within limitations that will make them agencies of good and not of evil, they will possess the country and defy the Government, as many of them do now.

But our friends on the other side charge all these abuses against the protective tariff. On the other side of the ocean they are attributed

to free trade. Sir Edward Sullivan, in an article in the Nineteenth Century of August, 1881, said:

The workmen are not working out the question by the abstract reasoning of others, but by their own experience; they know nothing of political economy, but they know what were the promises of the apostles of free trade, and they know what are the results. Bankers and brokers, and dealers in stocks, and importers of foreign manufactures may tell them that they are fools and do not know when they are well off. That may be so, but they know when they are badly off, and they are badly off now.

The reports of their delegates state that a very large proportion of the operative population of Great Britain (they put it at one-third) is out of work; that the rest have not on an average more than four days' work a week; that for five or six years they have been consuming their savings and the funds of their trade societies. One rich trade society has paid no less than £200,000 in "work pay" during the last five years and reduced its capital to less than £100,000.

Whatever the wealth of the country may be it has not penetrated down to them. Every year this wealth is accumulating into fewer hands; every year the gulf between rich and poor becomes deeper and broader. It is calculated that there are at this moment 14,500,000 of the people with less than 10s. 6d. a week to live on.

It would be just as fair to attribute to the protective tariff the evils of intemperance as to attribute to it the tendency of capital to form combinations, or of corporations to abuse their powers, or of the rich to grow richer and of the poor to grow poorer. Certainly the removal of the restrictions upon foreign commerce would not relieve us from these combinations unless through the destruction of the wealth of the country it should have that effect.

The foreign market as pictured to us by the free-trader is a delusion and a snare. We already sell there as much as there is any demand for. We successfully compete with other nations in the sale of cotton, grain, flour, petroleum, tobacco, and other things of our own special production, and can only hope to increase our exports materially by becoming the carrier of our own productions. Legitimately a nation should go abroad only for those things which it can not produce at home or can not produce in sufficient quantities to supply the demand of its people, and commerce between the nations should, in the main, be confined to these things. To go beyond this is to force the market of some other nation and do violence to the beautiful theory of the free-trader that a nation should shape its commercial policy for the common good of all mankind—for surely the common good of mankind would be best promoted by respecting the integrity of each country's market as to those things which it produces in quantities sufficient to satisfy the demand of its people. In this view we have little to complain of—our exports last year amounted to \$703,022,923, classified as follows:

Agriculture	\$323, 073, 774
Manufactures	135, 337, 574
Mining	11, 758, 730
The forest	21, 126, 212
The fisheries	5, 135, 771
All others	6, 570, 872
Total	703, 022, 923

The great disturbing element in the markets of the world is overproduction. Labor-saving machinery and appliances have so stimulated and increased production of every kind that, irrespective of commercial and industrial policies, there come times when the supply exceeds the demand and there ensues a business paralysis or stagnation that is only cured when consumption again overtakes production; and the great problem of the future is to so adjust the labor of the world to the new basis created by machinery as that it may find remunerative employment without bringing upon us the distresses incident to overproduction. And when this problem is solved it may solve the question of "strikes," which seemed to trouble the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] the other day, and which he attributed to the tariff, forgetting that the "strike" and "lockout" are free importations from free-trade England and that the argument that they grow out of the policy of free trade is much the stronger one.

Among civilized nations there is but one free-trader or rather but one tariff-for-revenue—only nation. All others, through restrictions on foreign commerce suited to their condition, endeavor to hold their own markets and support the policy which limits foreign importations to the things which they do not produce. The one nation which is an exception to this rule is England, and she is *sui generis*. Her insular position gives her special advantages as a maritime power. Very early she turned her attention to manufactures, and by a most rigid and even unscrupulous policy of protection, pursued for hundreds of years through tariffs and navigation laws, became the leading manufacturing nation and the ocean carrier of the world. Soon she was compelled to look abroad for food for her people and for raw material for her manufactures, and of necessity was compelled also to look abroad for a market for the surplus of her manufactured products, and so she began to plant colonies in every part of the world and adopted a policy with reference to them that compelled them to become consumers of her manufactures, in exchange for which they were required to furnish her food and raw material.

But she did not stop here; through diplomacy and with her cannons she from time to time took possession of markets all around the world, which she holds to-day, and when at last all these measures failed to meet her necessities, she as a measure of protection to her industries and trade, as purely protective in its operation and effect as the tariffs which she abandoned, adopted her so-called policy of free trade. Hav-

ing a large and constantly increasing surplus of manufactured goods which she was compelled to sell abroad to obtain food and raw material, she said to the nations whose markets were yet within their control, "Let us remove all restrictions on commerce; let trade be free; let me sell in your market freely and without restriction, and you shall so sell in mine, and great good will follow to us all." Sell in her market! Sell what? Sell manufactured goods there when every dollar's worth so sold would to that extent lessen her ability to buy the food and raw materials she must have? No; she did not intend that. She knew that she must because of her necessity and with her advantages could undersell her competitors not only in her own market but in all markets to which she was admitted duty free.

Her assurance of this was in her cheap skilled labor, her improved machinery, her abundant capital, her large production, and in the fact that she would carry to her own shores, upon her own terms, the greater part of the competing goods. Beside that, she still lays duties on foreign importations, and still discriminates against foreign manufactures, although gladly admitting all raw material free. For instance, she lays duties on tobacco and coffee, but discriminates in favor of her home manufactures, by placing still higher duties on roasted or ground coffee or any form of manufactured tobacco, and so with many other things. She takes care of her own household and deserves credit for it, but offers nothing to compensate us for admitting her to our market on equal terms. If we had the cheap labor, the capital, and the ships, England would still be a formidable competitor in the markets of the world. She already has control of markets in every quarter of the globe from which it would be difficult indeed to dislodge her, and she would maintain a keen competition for all others. In any view of the matter the foreign market as compensation for the loss or any serious impairment of our own great home market is a delusion and a snare.

If the time shall ever come when through the crowding of population and the accumulation of wealth our labor shall be cheapened and the other conditions coexist to render us independent of the competition of other nations, it will then be time enough to throw down our walls of protection and invite the unrestricted competition of the world. Until then it is the part of wisdom to sustain the policy and hold the market that has made us a prosperous people and given us a high place among nations.

If we look abroad for a market we ought first to turn our attention to securing control of, or at least an equal share with other nations in, the markets of this hemisphere. They are already valuable and steadily growing more so. There is a wonderful increase in the wealth and population of the South American states, and a growth in trade, industry, and all the peaceful arts which gives promise of a rich commerce. But to-day we fall behind Great Britain, France, Germany, and even Belgium in our trade with most of these states. Last year the exports of the Argentine Republic amounted to the sum of \$69,835,000 and her imports to \$95,403,000, and her trade with the countries named stood as follows:

Country.	Imports from.	Exports to.
Great Britain.....	\$33,432,660	\$10,071,850
France.....	17,022,038	22,342,183
Germany.....	8,044,875	6,950,908
Belgium.....	7,721,817	10,924,737
United States.....	7,673,284	3,580,406

In 1886-'87 the exports of Brazil to Great Britain amounted to \$32,410,720, and her imports from Great Britain to \$34,378,435, while her exports to the United States were \$52,593,716, and her imports from the United States were only \$8,071,653, a balance against us of \$44,522,063. For the same year the exports of Chili to Great Britain amounted to \$11,387,185, and her imports from that country to \$8,041,985, while her exports to us amounted to \$2,863,233, and her imports from us to but \$1,393,725. Our trade with these three countries is fairly representative of our trade with all the countries of that continent. There are twelve lines of steamers from the Argentine Republic to Europe, and an ocean cable to London, but none to the United States. This tells the story of European supremacy in the markets of these States. To secure the trade of these countries we must offer them as good if not better facilities for an exchange of products than they enjoy with Europe.

To do this we must have our own ships and be able to establish as many steam-ship lines as their commerce demands. But we have no ships and we find the ocean covered with the subsidized ships of Great Britain, France, Germany, and other nations, and independent of the subsidies with which these nations protect their commercial marines, we find that because of the high price of American labor we can neither build nor sail ships as cheaply as they, and consequently can not compete with them in the carrying of even our own trade. In this situation there is but one of two things to do—sit still and do nothing as we have been doing for so many years, or else by subsidy build up a commercial marine as we have built up our system of internal transportation, by unlimited appropriations to railroads and for the improvement of rivers

and harbors—subsidies that will enable us to compete successfully with other nations for the carrying trade of the world.

But at this point the Democratic party meet us again with the constitutional objection—a want of power. I would find the power in that fair and reasonable construction of that instrument of which I have spoken, which gives it effect not only according to its letter but its spirit, and I believe with Col. J. R. G. Pitkin, whose language I now quote from a speech recently delivered by him before the National Convention of the American Shipping and Industrial League at New Orleans, that—

A nation by its right to be, to conserve itself, must expand its powers; and it loyally construes its charter when it regulates commerce to that end. The Constitution that belted a union of thirteen States must be let out to the girth of the great nation which is not to be emaciated and stifled by a narrow construction of the letter that is perfidy to the spirit. It is not an instrument in which can be found by remote implication an intent or sanction to waste our substance on foreign fleets in an annual drain of \$150,000,000, or to divest from our labor the legitimate dues by which it may be a nerved, sanguine, steadfast American force to compel wide elbow room in the world.

The only remedy the Democratic party suggests to relieve the unhappy condition of our commercial marine is what they call "free ships;" which means that we shall abandon ship-building—let it become to us one of the lost arts—and buy our ships on the Mersey and the Clyde, forgetting that subsidies to foreign ships still shut us out of the field of competition. What better use could be made of the surplus than to employ it in building up our shipping and in preparing the way for our admission on equal terms to the foreign market which our greatly increasing production renders so desirable? We can not afford to give up our own home market for the chance of a foreign market, or even in exchange for it; yet wise statesmanship requires us to inaugurate such measures as will in the no distant future secure to us equal advantages in the markets of the world. Let the "surplus" be devoted to rebuilding the Navy; to restoring our commercial marine to the proud position it once occupied; to the development and improvement of internal transportation; to the payment of liberal pensions to the old soldiers, who have made all the promise of our future possible, and the people will not complain; they will sanction and approve it all.

Notwithstanding the frightful pictures of distress growing out of excessive taxation to which we have been treated in the course of this debate, no man can lay his finger upon a single instance of real distress resulting from national taxation, and the people are nowhere complaining of it. In its daily round the sun does not shine on a more prosperous country than this, and their fancy pictures of distress are mere creations of the imagination, intended for use in the coming political campaign. A gentleman on the other side, from the State of Texas, complains that, admitting we pay higher wages than any other country, yet, to use his own language—

It is also an established fact that the laborer in the United States can not, as a general rule, save anything from the result of his toil at the end of each year.

And adds—

Then what is the difference between earning \$1 per day or 10 cents per day, if the result is the same, namely, sufficient to eat to preserve life, and sufficient to wear to protect the body?

It is Buchanan's doctrine of 10 cents a day come again. This statement may fairly represent the condition of labor in the gentleman's State, and in the South generally, for some little observation in that region prepares me to believe it, and I am willing he shall confess for his section of the country, but not for mine. In no sense does his statement truly represent the condition of labor in Ohio, or anywhere north of Mason and Dixon's line. The deposits in the Northern savings-banks and in building associations refutes it, and it is absolutely refuted by the surroundings of comfort, convenience, and even of ornament and taste with which the homes of labor are filled in the North, whether on the farm, at the furnaces, or at the factories. Nowhere else in the world has labor such surroundings. You may find squalor and wretchedness in certain quarters of every great city, but there is no "general rule," as stated by the gentleman, applicable to the labor of the North.

Every man familiar with Northern life will bear testimony to the truth of what I say; and the census of 1880 shows that no more than 1 in 505 of the people of the Northern States receives public relief, while in England in 1868 about 1 in every 18 persons was in receipt of parochial relief. In the city where I reside, most of the men of family, who earn their living by labor in its numerous workshops and factories, own their homes, which they have purchased from the savings of their labor, and because of these savings small properties of \$1,000 and less in value are almost as marketable as wheat and corn, and I undertake to say that this is not unusual in the towns and cities and in the country places of the North. The earnings of our labor have made it intelligent, independent, and self-respecting, as befits men who are charged with the responsible duties of a citizenship such as ours, and it demands a continuance of the policy which has protected it against the underpaid, underfed, and degraded labor of the old world, and if not heard now, will be heard in November. This is labor's battle and labor will decide it.

Petitions come here from the men in the mills, the factories, and workshops of the country, from the manufacturers who give them employment, from the farmers and stock-raisers, from the lumbermen, and

from the miners, asking for the preservation of this policy and for the defeat of the Mills bill as the forerunner of its destruction; but where are the petitions from the people anywhere in all the land asking for a reduction of tariff duties? Who is it that inspires this crusade against the industries of the country? Not the farmers, not the manufacturers, not the workmen; no, not these, but would-be political economists, with learning enough to be dangerous; disciples of Calhoun, who have never been charged with the responsibilities of government until within the last three years, and whose knowledge of any industrial system is of one that is dead and into which the question of wages never entered, and English emissaries of free trade, organized for the conquest of the American market.

From these come the inspiration for this warfare against the prosperity of the country. These men have control of the Democratic party and our safety lies in depriving it of the power it so abuses, and which was so improvidently placed in its hands. That day is near at hand. The men who toil, the old soldiers of the Union, and all those who intelligently and sincerely desire the continued prosperity of the country will have their innings in November next, and will re-establish the American policy, the policy of Henry Clay, the policy of the old Whig party, and of the Republican party, on foundations so firm that even the Bourbon Democracy will be convinced of the futility of ever again assailing it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to occupy any of the time of the committee in the discussion of the pending bill. Its merits, if any merit it has, and its demerits, and they are to my mind many and glaring, were so well known to every gentleman on this floor whom I could hope to reach or influence by anything I might say that any suggestions on my part seemed not needed. My mind has not changed on that score. But, Mr. Chairman, last evening I received such a petition from many hundreds of people in my district protesting against the passage of this most unjust, unwise, and uncalled-for measure that I am impelled to say a word in presenting it to the American Congress. This petition, Mr. Chairman, is signed by many hundreds of people in my little city who know what labor is. They live by the toil of their own hands. Glad am I to say that they are intelligent people. They understand the meaning of protection. They know what the passage of the Mills bill means to them, they know what it means to all American workmen, and they raise their voices by this petition in solemn protestation against its passage.

Look at this petition, gentlemen of the majority. Its length is measured by yards and its signers are numbered by hundreds, and yet this is not the only petition of like tenor presented by me to Congress.

Thousands of laboring men in the district I have the honor to represent are begging Congress to defeat this bill. They are workers of wool and of cotton, of iron and of glass, the mechanic and the farmer. Mr. Chairman, do they stand alone in making this request? Need I make answer? Why, sir, the term of the gentleman from Texas is hardly long enough to enable him to count the number of names of those throughout this prosperous land who have invoked Congress by petition not to disturb our industries, not to cripple our manufactures, not to place our happy and contented and prosperous working people on a level with those less favored in other lands by the passage of the Mills bill.

These petitioners are not confined to any district or any State. Why, sir, I have received remonstrances even from the State of Texas. Is it because these petitioners are outnumbered by those favoring the passage of the bill that no heed is paid to them by the gentlemen across the aisle? Is it because the districts represented on this floor by Democrats are asking for its passage that a deaf ear is turned by the gentlemen of the majority to this petition I present, and hundreds of others like it?

Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that a single petition has been presented asking for the passage of the Mills bill. When the American people are interested they let that interest be known. If the people of these United States, or any considerable number of them, desired the passage of the Mills bill, think you, sir, they would have remained so long silent? Has not nearly every gentleman on this floor received many petitions in reference to the copyright bill, the pension bills, the educational bill, the swamp-land bill, the direct-tax bill, and numerous other measures now pending before the House? Have we not all received protests against this bill? If petitions have been sent here favoring its passage they have been smothered in obscurity.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard no farmers crying for the passage of this bill; nor do I believe I will while nine-tenths of their products are used for home consumption. I have heard no laboring man ask for its passage. Do you think, sir, they will so petition while their wages approximate double those paid in every other country on the globe?

Who is it, then, that wants the provisions of the Mills bill enacted into law? Ah, sir, I believe that question will be answered next November in no uncertain tones. I believe the verdict of the people at the polls will answer, "Not the American people, but the British free-traders and their allies." [Applause.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have sought this opportunity during the continuance of this extended, and in some respects remarkable, debate to give expression to some of the views entertained by me concerning this bill, and also concerning the policy of this Administration

on the subject-matter thereof, and on a question intimately connected with the proposed revision of the tariff. Not that I shall enter upon a lengthy discussion of the latter, but that before this controversy closes I may state some of the things I would like to see done in the way of revising the inequalities of our present tariff law in harmony with the declarations of my party and the best and wisest sentiments of a majority of its thoughtful people. Nearly five sessions of experience in this body has taught me how difficult it is to accomplish the most inconsequential legislation if a single one of the three hundred and twenty-five members of the House sets himself actively and persistently at work to prevent that legislation.

How many of the hundreds who have from time to time been members of the lower branch of Congress have realized most emphatic, if not bitter, disappointment when, on assuming their relation with the House of Representatives of the United States of America, they found themselves surrounded on all sides by insurmountable walls in the name and form of rules, constructed by their antecedent legislators, ostensibly for the purpose of facilitating deliberation and legislation, but effectuating the most complete legislative tyranny possible to conceive! I can not answer, but know I am within the bounds of truth when I surmise their number to be "legion;" so when I wish to put upon record some of the changes I would like to see made in our existing law, or in the so-called Mills bill before it shall, if ever, become a law, I am sensible how unreasonable may be the hope that such changes as I may desire, if their wisdom were conceded by a large majority of the present membership of the House, will be made either in existing statute or pending bill. Notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, however, each member has his individual duty to perform, his responsibility here and elsewhere to meet, and for one I shall hesitate not in doing the best I can to make plain my position.

Mr. Chairman, among the few things—some commendable, some despicable—done by this Administration there are at least three for which it can not escape if it would the condemnation of a majority of the most thoughtful and intelligent people of the country. For three attacks, neither of which involved the least exposure to physical danger, this Administration will be justly celebrated. First, the attack on the silver dollar; second, that upon the outstanding greenbacks, and, third, that upon the protective system under which this Government has grown and prospered, and by reason of which, as we on this side of the Chamber believe and declare, she has attained financially, commercially, intellectually, and nationally the proud distinction accorded her by the civilized world. The first attack, as all gentlemen present remember, was begun early.

Indeed, it appears that so much was the President-elect wrought upon by his own fears, or the importunities of influential single standard gold men of the country—which on this precise point practically means New York City—that prior to the time when, under the Constitution and laws, he could officially say or do anything, the country was amused and surprised to find that he, on February 24, 1885, had deliberately written certain prominent members of his party then in the House of Representatives, urging them, by indirect if not direct words, to a repeal of the law of February 23, 1878, under and by virtue of which the regular monthly purchase and coinage of silver dollars are being carried on. This, sir, was a most remarkable spectacle, the like of which I do not recall.

How this early, this pre-official attack upon the financial system of the country was followed up by the Administration is readily shown by reference to the first official communication of the President to Congress—his first annual message.

Now, sir, while I do not intend to discuss for one moment the silver question as related to our present coinage laws, and only wish, as indicating an opinion, to make brief declaration of my sympathy with the principle of bi-metallism, I can not forbear, in view of the bitter—I had almost said venomous—attacks made upon our tariff system by the Administration and by the great majority of the Democrats in the House and in the Senate since this debate began, calling attention to this first assault of the President upon the silver currency of the country.

As a text to this immediate discussion a wild and apparently deep-felt alarm was sounded. Uttered by the President in his last partial annual message to Congress—reference to every other subject of national or international concern being spurned as unworthy in comparison with the one thing forming the alpha and omega of this state paper—the cry has been iterated and reiterated over and over again during this debate that our whole land is in peril most imminent and threatening.

Why, Mr. Chairman, to read the message attacking protection, and the Democratic vociferations of calamities now on the country, and every day augmented at most fearful rate, if one accepted as literally true either the President's extreme utterances, or discarding those, the wild, fanatical, and vicious declamations of many of the free-traders who have spoken since this debate began, he would conclude at once that this country is going straight to perdition by the shortest route possible.

Now, I say upon the history of this Administration, already of more than three years' duration, that these cries are those of alarmists in high places and nothing more.

To prove this let me briefly recur to the policy and utterances of the Administration on the silver question.

I have already cited the unusual, pre-official attack made, and indicated that it was thereafter officially followed up.

Let us refer to the first message of President Cleveland to Congress, turning to pages 22 and 23 of the messages and documents of 1885 and 1886 as printed, and we will find such sentences as these:

The necessity for such an addition to the silver currency of the nation as is compelled by the silver-coinage act is negated by the fact that up to the present time only about fifty millions of the silver dollars so coined have actually found their way into circulation, leaving more than one hundred and sixty millions in the possession of the Government, the custody of which has entailed a considerable expense for the construction of vaults for its deposit.

Every month two millions of gold in the public Treasury are paid out for two millions or more of silver dollars, to be added to the idle mass already accumulated. If continued long enough this operation will result in the substitution of silver for all the gold the Government owns applicable to its general purposes. * * * The proportion of silver and its certificates received by the Government will probably increase as time goes on, for the reason that the nearer the period approaches when it will be obliged to offer silver in payment of its obligations, the greater inducement there will be to hoard gold against depreciation in the value of silver, or for the purpose of speculation.

This hoarding of gold has already begun. When the time comes that gold has been withdrawn from circulation there will be apparent the difference between the real value of the silver dollar and a dollar in gold, and the two coins will part company. * * * The hoarding of gold which has already taken place indicates that we shall not escape the usual experience in such cases.

So, if this silver coinage be continued, we may reasonably expect that gold and its equivalent will abandon the field of circulation to silver alone. This, of course, must produce a severe contraction of our circulating medium, instead of adding to it. * * *

And on pages 25 and 26 of this same publication will be found such sentences as these:

We have now on hand all the silver dollars necessary to supply the present needs of the people and to satisfy those who from sentiment wish to see them in circulation; and if their coinage is suspended, they can be readily obtained by all who desire them. * * * If the need of more is at any time apparent, their coinage may be renewed.

That disaster has not already overtaken us furnishes no proof that danger does not wait upon a continuation of the present silver coinage. We have been saved by the most careful management and unusual expedients, by a combination of fortunate conditions, and by a confident expectation that the course of the Government in regard to silver coinage would be speedily changed by the action of Congress. Prosperity hesitates upon our threshold because of the dangers and uncertainties surrounding this question. Capital timidly shrinks from trade, and investors are unwilling to take the chance of the questionable state in which their money will be returned to them, while enterprise halts at a risk against which care and sagacious management do not protect. * * * I recommend the suspension of the compulsory coinage of silver dollars, directed by the law passed in February, 1878.

A year passed. The following message contained a brief reference to the coinage of silver and to the views expressed in his first communication to Congress, which were reaffirmed. Another year passed, and the subject of silver coinage was wholly ignored.

It may be the "hoarding of gold" referred to by the President has not only been commenced and continued in some parts of the country, and that somewhere in some secluded spot of "gold bugs" gold and silver have, as the President predicted, parted company, and it may be perilous, crushing times have come somewhere, but I want to say most emphatically that such conditions as the President prophesied have not come to pass in my section of the country. Why, sir, as matter of every-day fact, there has been more gold in the safes and on the counters of the bankers of Northwest Iowa since the above-quoted words were written than I ever knew of before in that part of the country.

If you had gone into any of the banks doing a general business in the district I have the honor to represent at any time during the past three years you would have seen, as can be seen now, plenty of gold, and the banks can hardly put it out, because people, under the magnificent financial system enacted by the Republican party, know that for every practical purpose of trade and financial transaction a paper dollar serves them as well as either gold or silver and is vastly more convenient to handle. In the light of this indisputable fact of the presence of an abundance of gold on the counters of the bankers of the West, what becomes of the great hue and cry of the President that silver was fast driving out gold; that the gold was fast being hoarded, and would soon disappear from the sight of all but the miserly hoarders of it.

What has become of the prediction of the President that financial and commercial disaster would follow unless the coinage of the silver dollar was suspended? Despite local disturbances and local failures to realize the measure of prosperity hoped for, the fact remains that in the grand West at least railroad and town building, entries upon and purchase of land have gone on at rapid rate, and while the farmers of the country have not realized as much for their farm products as they desired, nor as they ought, yet I deny that during these years following this alarm sounded by the President, they have been, as some here have essentially depicted, going pell-mell to the poor-house.

But I shall recur to the farmers later on in my remarks.

Now, I maintain that this plentifulness of gold in the West, in every bank, large or small, engaged in a general business, could not have existed during all this time since the President sounded his excited alarm, and announced the "parting of company" of the two metals, the hoarding of gold and its disappearance from sight, were it not that our general condition of trade and finance has been fairly good.

If the general condition of the country in regard to the existence of an ample gold fund in the hands of bankers may be properly estimated

by the condition of the National Treasury as to gold receipts during the past four years, there would seem to be no fear of early disappearance of "shining shekels."

On November 1, 1884, there were in gold in the National Treasury..	\$134, 670, 790
On November 1, 1885	142, 333, 589
On November 1, 1886	158, 537, 179
On October 1, 1887	192, 957, 181

Or a gain of nearly \$60,000,000.

The last monthly statement of the Treasurer is not at hand, but the one of date of March 31, 1888, shows a net gold coin and bullion balance in the Treasury of \$218,818,253.63, while the net silver balance was only \$43,886,782.09. I am aware that this is not a decisive criterion by which to judge the accuracy of the President's predictions, and that to present such complete criterion might demand a full survey of the field of trade and finance, the condition of our exports and imports of the precious metals; but, inasmuch as I have only sought to prove there was no just occasion for the deep apprehension felt by the President in forecasting such near and direful consequences unless the coinage of silver should be immediately abated, the above reference is, in my judgment, quite sufficient.

The Administration's second attack was made upon the few million of "greenbacks" still in circulation and use among the people. Not only must silver go if the Administration can have its way, but the "greenbacks" must go quickly and not stand much on the order of their going.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when I have listened to these many, very many, iterations and reiterations from Democrats of this House and elsewhere, as they sound the praises ascribed this Democratic administration—how it is the government of the poor man, the foe of monopoly, the guardian angel of the "meek and lowly" as againsts the high and crafty, the rich and exacting—to all this nonsense that has flowed like an almost ceaseless current of sickening self-adulation I have felt, in the face of the solemn facts, like turning away in shame and disgust.

In his reply to the House resolution of February 3, 1886, reported by Mr. BLAND, calling him to inform the House, among other things,—

What amount of silver dollars was in the Treasury on the 4th day of March last that could have been applied in the payment of the interest-bearing debt and other dues of the Government, and what amount of such dollars is now held in the Treasury that could be so applied; also, what amount of silver certificates is held in the Treasury that could be reissued; also, what amount of interest-bearing debt is now subject to call, and will the same policy be pursued in the payment of silver thereon and on other public dues as in the past?—

Mr. Manning, then Secretary of the Treasury, after having referred to the number of silver dollars then in the Treasury, and answering the question as to what application could be made of those accumulating in the Treasury, said:

As to what application "could" be made of them—

Note the irony—

being questioned, I respectfully answer, besides what is elsewhere said, that by careful management, so as neither to contract the currency nor to force a silver basis, these silver dollars might all, in time, be applied to withdraw and cancel the United States notes, which are "other dues of the Government" now payable. But my power to do so is left in doubt by the act of May 31, 1878. I therefore suggest its repeal, in order to provide a larger use for silver. * * * No other part of the public debt is subject to call at the option of the United States before September 1, 1891, except the United States notes, to the payment of which in coin or its equivalent (besides the redemption which has been kept up since 1878) the faith of the United States was solemnly pledged in the act of March 18, 1869. The amount of these notes now subject to call is \$346,773,116. * * * A reform of the currency, coupled with the payment of the two sums now alone payable at the option of the United States prior to September, 1891—

Meaning the residue of the 3 per cent. bonds, loan of July 1, 1882, amounting to \$174,092,100, and the "greenbacks"—would constitute a financial achievement exceeding any other which has heretofore been attempted within such a period of time.

It is true no formal attempt was made thereafter to summarily dispose of—pay off and cancel the \$346,000,000 of the paper currency then and now in circulation—the remnant of that vast volume of similar paper money issued by the Government during the memorable struggle of 1861 to 1865; it is also true that the Secretary who penned the above condemnation of the remaining paper-currency issue not wholly based on coin has, since then, passed to his final resting-place; but the official act clearly expressing the hostility of this administration to the "greenbacks" of the nation remains. The attack was most seriously made, and the disposition to go the full measure that Wall street might wish disclosed.

The third attack, as I have seen fit to enumerate them in the beginning of my remarks, is that made by the President in his last annual message, and now being most vigorously and tenaciously supported by the free-trade members of this body upon the principle of economics so well defined by the word "protection." And while I would deplore success on the part of the Democratic party to seriously endanger this principle as applied in the collection of our necessary revenue, yet I must say I have experienced a profound satisfaction in the fact that now and hereafter during the approaching Presidential campaign, and I trust subsequent thereto and during the period of the existence of the present great competing parties, we are to know where the Democratic party as a party stands on this question; for whatever the mere verbal statement of the next Democratic platform may be, the position of that party is now more clearly defined by Presidential and Democratic

Congressional utterance than ever before, and no skillful manipulation of words at St. Louis whereby, as in the last national platform of that party, the protectionists in the East and the free-traders in the West could, and did, with apparent equal sincerity, maintain that the party was committed to one or the other principle as was necessary to allure the elector, can, in the coming campaign, obscure the fact or deceive men of ordinary intelligence as to the real attitude of the Democratic party toward this important issue. The fearless and able defense of the protective principle made by such Democratic members as RANDALL, FORAN, MCADOO, and a few others—members of this House—can not break the force attaching to the President's message and the great volume of Democratic utterance in the two Halls of Congress in support of it.

I say, then, welcome be the day, and all the days in political discussion, when the country on this question of tariff shall be able unmistakably to locate each of the great parties correctly, and know, as they must, that the one means unyielding opposition to protection and the advocacy of free trade, the other the same intense and uncompromising allegiance to that principle which has, in every platform since the organization of the Republican party, marked its history and will continue to be one of its cardinal doctrines to the end of its days.

Of the so-called Mills bill let me here say that while I entertain strong feeling that Congress should revise the existing tariff so as to bring about such an administration of our revenue system, both of customs duties and internal revenue, as will promise relief from so large a surplus in the future, I can not and will not support this bill unless materially amended; and while doubting that, in the condition of the legislative mind as it exists in the House at this time, it will be possible to secure such amendments as will make it acceptable, it appears to me to be my duty to favor its consideration through the various parliamentary stages of discussion, both general and under the five-minute rule, in the hope that eventually it may come forth bearing far less resemblance to its former self and presenting a face and form in no feature of which may be traceable the strong lines of free-trade venom which now so seriously disfigure it. Therefore, if at the conclusion of general debate the opponents of the measure shall attempt to have the enacting clause of the bill stricken out, as was done in the Forty-eighth Congress in relation to another bill relating to this subject, I shall deem it my duty to vote with those who favor further consideration, at the same time declaring that, unless amended in nearly all the particulars hereafter named, it shall receive, on the attempt to pass it, my emphatic negative.

The great demand of the hour is such legislation, not alone of revision of the tariff and internal-revenue laws, but of wise and judicious appropriations as will reduce the large excess now existing and prevent future unnecessary accumulations in the public Treasury.

I agree that the existence of an ample public purse should lead to no unjustifiable and unnecessary expenditure of the public money, but with this fact in mind I am free to say that there are some objects of national concern requiring outlays of money which may well receive the attention of Congress at this time.

First among these objects as they appear to my mind is a just enlargement and readjustment of our pension laws with a view to the administration of a larger measure of justice to the men who, by reason of service in the Army during the late war, are now maimed or diseased to an extent unfitting them partially or totally to earn a livelihood for themselves and those legally dependent upon them. And by this is meant not only a more liberal allowance to those who have and can establish their claims under existing laws and rules of the Department, but also ex-soldiers who, while, strictly speaking, unable to connect their present disabilities with army service, can show conclusively that their present ailments are not due to their own immoral and vicious habits, but to other causes for which they may not be responsible, and hence placing them where they may well receive reasonable aid from the Government.

To this class, irrespective of any disability of a pensionable degree, I would add every one of our living soldiers, who, being in the service and line of duty, was captured and incarcerated more than thirty days in any of the Southern prisons. These men, while in a position in which capture was a well-understood incident of war, and as to which they knew on enlistment they would stand in danger, nevertheless I contend they can not reasonably be held to the understanding that the imprisonment to which they might, on capture, be subjected, would not be in accordance with civilized warfare, and that they would be starved to death in dens and pens of disgusting, sickening filth, nor that their terms of confinement might, for any reason of public policy, if such was ever the case, be unduly lengthened because of any failure, avoidable or unavoidable, to effect their timely exchange, and thereby, and by reason of the inhuman hardships to which they were by their captors subjected, the chances of their final deliverance so much curtailed as to amount to a most serious lessening of the possibilities of life.

To this class, then, I would immediately grant reasonable pensions, to be in addition to any pension they may now draw by reason of any specific ailment or wound.

From my standpoint I venture to say that the sense of justice which in the Forty-ninth Congress led a Democratic House and Republican Senate to pass a dependent-pension bill in aid of the dependent soldiers

of the late war, their widows and orphans, more nearly met the approval of the loyal people of this country than the act of the President that prevented the action of Congress becoming effectual.

A bill in the same Congress granting a qualified service pension to every soldier, sailor, or marine who, being sixty-two years of age, served in the war with Mexico fourteen days, or was, during their enlistment, *en route* to the seat war, passed the same Congress and was a well understood companion piece of legislation with the vetoed dependent-pension bill above referred to. This measure gave not less than 65 per cent. of the amount appropriated to Southern men, regardless of the fact whether they were rebels during the late war or not, always excepting the chief traitor.

This bill was readily sanctioned by the President; the other, providing very similar benefits for the Union soldier, was apparently as readily denied Executive sanction. Not only so, but a strong effort is now being made to enlarge the scope of the Mexican pension bill, and no doubt it will be done soon after the next election. Now, in view of all this, what is the manifest duty of Congress? Let the bill now pending on the report of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions on Senate bill No. 181, entitled "An act granting pensions to ex-soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to dependent relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors," be soon taken up and passed that the many and deserving people coming within its terms may know that the Congress of the United States holds in further remembrance the invaluable services of dependent ex-Union soldiers as well as those more unfortunate than they. Finally, but most emphatically, on this subject let the limitation upon the arrears of pension for disability be removed; its continuance is a disgrace to the Republic. I note with pleasure the report filed to-day on that subject, though I have not yet examined it. Next to these classes may be enumerated suitable improvement of the navigation of all important and navigable rivers and harbors, and the construction of suitable, substantial, and enduring public buildings in our larger cities, where the public interests are great by reason of large postal service, or in addition thereto the courts of the United States are permanently located.

Other manifestly worthy objects of public care and the public revenue might be enumerated, but these may suffice to indicate my views generally on the subject of appropriations. But all these being provided for from time to time, as can be done—and certainly it can not all be done in one year, nor two even, but will require many—there will yet remain at the present rate of national income, as I am led to believe, a considerable sum of money more than will be disbursed in the usual appropriations, and indeed, millions more than will be required. How shall this unnecessary amount be prevented from further lodgment in the vaults now so weary, if we may believe our Democratic free-traders, of their contents? We will see.

I count it one of the marked features of our present tariff law that not only the manufacturers and producers in other lines, but that our farmers are not forgotten. Here is the list of articles in which the farmer deals and the rate of duty according to existing law:

Animals, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Beef and pork, 1 cent per pound. Hams and bacon, 2 cents per pound. Meat, extract of, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Cheese 4 cents per pound. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 4 cents per pound. Lard, 2 cents per pound. Wheat, 20 cents per bushel. Rye and barley, 10 cents per bushel. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, one-half cent per pound. Barley malt, per bushel of 34 pounds, 20 cents. Indian corn or maize, 10 cents per bushel. Oats, 10 cents per bushel. Corn meal, 10 cents per bushel of 48 pounds. Oatmeal, one-half cent per pound. Rye-flour, one-half cent per pound. Wheat flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Rice, cleaned, 2½ cents per pound; uncleaned, 1½ cents per pound. Paddy, 1½ cents per pound. Rice flour and rice meal, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Hay, \$2 per ton. Honey, 20 cents per gallon. Hops, 8 cents per pound. Milk, preserved or condensed, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Pickles and sauces of all kinds, not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem. Potatoes, 15 cents per bushel of 60 pounds. Vegetables, in their natural state, or in salt or brine, not otherwise provided for, 10 per cent. ad valorem. Vegetables, prepared or preserved, of all kinds not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem. Currants, 1 cent per pound. Fruits preserved in their own juice and fruit juices, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Flax straw, \$5 per ton. Flax, not hauled or dressed, \$20 per ton. Flax hauled, known as "dressed line," \$40 per ton. Tow of flax or hemp, \$10 per ton.

What has become of this farmers' list of duties in the Mills bill? "Gone where the woodbine twineth," every one of them, except the following:

Rice. Rice flour. Paddy, or rice having outer hull on. Peanuts.

There is nothing mean about this; is there? Oh, no; every grain, all meats, vegetables, potatoes, hay, and, in short, everything the Northern farmer raises, dropped quietly out of the present dutiable list, while the great rice and less important peanut crop is duly cared for.

The great food supplies of one section utterly neglected, the great food product of the other section duly protected. Ah, what sublime equity.

And then the potato yield of Northern fields forgotten, while the gay and festive peanut "bobs up serenely," kindly sandwiched between rice and raisins on one side and mustard and cotton manufactures on the other. The peanut is a lucky little fellow. [Laughter.]

Take him up tenderly,
Finch him with care,
Fashioned so slenderly,
Young, and so fair!
Peanut.

[Laughter.]

This Mills bill is truly odious, as has been said. It proposes to accomplish a reduction of revenue by dropping out the whole range of Northern farm products, placing some other articles on the free-list, reducing the duty on many other articles of home production, at the same time making but a slight reduction in the rate of duty on sugar, none on rice, and carefully favoring the Southern cotton-raiser by letting in his iron and steel cotton-ties free, and by making reduction on nearly all manufactured products. I am unmistakably opposed to any such sectional propositions.

I am also opposed to placing flax and its straw on the free-list, or to reducing the duty on the oil.

The people in my part of the country have for many years raised a considerable surplus of flax, and in the general depression of prices, and at times of partial failure of crops, they have found it of good reliance as to certainty of yield and price, and so much so as to have been most helpful in their years of hardship and trial in developing a new country. Large oil mills have been erected in Iowa, Minnesota, and other States west, and at Sioux City, in the district I have the honor to represent, one of the largest and finest mills in the country has recently been constructed and is now operated, thus, to a marked extent, eliminating a considerable per cent. of distance and charges from the list of fees usually taxed on shipment of flaxseed to distant points of manufacture and consumption. During the past sixty days I have received and presented to the House more petitions, bearing more numerous signatures of people residing in Northwest Iowa, praying that the duty on linseed oil be not reduced, than on any other subject since the commencement of my Congressional service in 1883, unless it be a single petition from laboring men. The proposition to alter the duty on flax its oil and fiber has, if I can estimate the sentiments of a large number of my constituents, met their positive and hearty disapproval.

I am also opposed to placing wool on the free-list. It is a farm product and represents the little surplus yield of too many families in the land for me to favor its being placed on that list. In the Forty-eighth Congress my vote was cast against restoring this commodity to the rate provided by the law of 1867. That did not seem to me to be necessary, and my convictions are most positive now that the farmers and stockmen who are engaged in this industry should not be compelled to take a level with the sheep-raisers of Australia and the South American countries; and particularly so in view of the large increase in the importations of wools and wool manufactures during the fiscal year of 1887.

On page 26 of the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, among other articles on the dutiable list as to which there was an increase of importations as compared with the previous year, he gives the following:

Wools:	
Combing.....	\$919,796
Carpet.....	1,978,295
Wool manufactures.....	3,481,399

These values do not represent increased price so much as of quantity, and, therefore, of value more largely based on increased importation.

Before passing on this subject, however, I would like to suggest to both the majority and minority of the Committee on Ways and Means whether such change can not be made in any bill that may become law, if any shall this Congress, in respect of the basis of duty on wool, as will give to the River Platte country an equal opportunity with other foreign countries to enter its wool in American ports. My information is that, by reason of the character of the soil and climate, the South American wool, while of average quality with that from Australia, takes on and retains a much larger quantity of filth, thereby increasing its weight out of proportion with the cleaner grades from other countries, and making it impossible of equally favorable entry with other wools of similar quality but carrying less of dirt.

This unintentional discrimination now existing against the South American wool is, I am satisfied, operating to retard the extent of our commerce with that country, and this is my reason for calling attention to it.

But my most serious objection to this bill, the asserted object of which is to reduce the annual revenue, is that it entirely overlooks the one article on the dutiable list in dealing with which in a statesman-like manner more money can be at once saved to the entire people of the country, and not the least harm be done those now or hereafter to be engaged in the production or handling of the commodity, than in dealing with any other article on that list.

I refer to sugar. In the annual statements of receipts and expenditures of the Government, actual or estimated, made by the Secretary of the Treasury from year to year, the form adopted and long maintained has become a familiar one. For instance, the estimated revenues of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, as stated on page 7 of the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, are:

From customs.....	\$228,000,000
From internal revenue.....	120,000,000
From sales of public lands.....	10,000,000
And so on down the grade, amounting in all to.....	383,000,000

Therefore it is that a glance at such statement at once rivets the eyes on the two immense sums resulting from customs and internal revenue. True, the aggregate of estimates of receipts from other sources

is considerable, but none of them seem to be of a character to invite special attack when searching for sources of revenue to be curtailed. If I am not in error no one in all this debate has made a specialty of singling out any one or more of these minor sources of revenue. The war has been waged on these two, the free-traders selecting the customs duties as primarily the ones to afford the remedy sought, and the extreme and most radical protectionists aiming their guns at the internal revenue.

For my part, I do not think the latter should be the first resort in seeking a remedy, but that the customs list, and first that article upon that list which presents the greatest inequality in respect of the cost to the consumer as compared with the number of people and the area of country protected by the present duty.

At this stage of my remarks I can not, in deference to my own convictions and what I firmly believe to be the convictions of a large majority of the people of Iowa, and also of the Republicans of that State, refrain from taking issue with my esteemed colleague [Mr. KERR], as well as with a distinguished Senator from Iowa now serving in the other legislative branch of the Government [Senator WILSON], and whose judgment and ability I hold in high regard, upon the propriety of abolishing the internal-revenue system, and particularly the tax on liquors.

Those gentlemen and myself are in accord upon the great question of State prohibition as now represented by the statutes of Iowa, and when in the rapid course of political events it is apparent that it will be wise to extend that question to the broader domain of national legislation—as to which may God speed the day—I expect, if we are all living, to be in harmony with them then; but, sir, notwithstanding the fact that many excellent men and women in Iowa and elsewhere believe that in taxing men who engage in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors the Government thereby and in so doing becomes a sharer, a partner in the abominable traffic, I differ with them. Now, if in the consideration of this question it is to be viewed solely from a high moral point and in relation to ethics alone, I would take no issue with these gentlemen but at once coincide, but I am disposed to look at it in this light: Here is a National Government charged with the authority and responsibility under the Constitution of maintaining a system of revenue that shall in its operations occasion as little burden and hardship upon the people as possible.

In the exercise of this power that Federal Government, which is purely official, deals with thirty-eight States, some of which are widely separated, having local conditions and sentiments on many questions as widely different as their locations; each one possessing a sovereignty absolute and complete on the question of the administration of its police power, and therefore each alone possessing the sole authority to decide what its policy shall be, whether to license or tax liquors and those who manufacture or sell them, or entirely prohibit such manufacture and sale. Bearing this in mind, we must agree that tobacco and liquors have, during much of our history, been treated as proper articles of taxation, particularly when large sums of money had to be raised; and both these commodities being of a class not necessary as food or sustenance for the body, while large and increasing sums of money must be had for national support, I can not see, as a practical question of statesmanship, why the tax should at this time be in the least removed from liquors and dealers, unless as to some grades used in the arts and sciences, nor why it should be to any considerable extent removed from tobacco, cigars, cheroots, etc.

It is a well-known fact that but about five of the States in the Union have passed prohibitory statutes. As to such, if the present national law operates to interfere with the sovereignty of the State, or the enforcement of her laws passed to suppress intemperance, I make bold to say that such changes in our Federal laws should be made as will not so interfere with those of any State. But this is one question, and the right and justice of taxation as applied to these things under our federal system is another. Let us be sensible and practical in this, holding ourselves ready to move to higher ground morally when good sense dictates it can be done and should be done as matter of statesmanship.

Another thought, briefly. The expenses of Government in a general sense must necessarily increase as development and expansion go on. Large and growing sums of money will annually be needed. All of these should not be raised from customs duties. Perhaps it might not be going too far to make a change in the tobacco schedule, to reduce the rate on all kinds or clear chewing and plain smoking altogether; but certainly other kinds should not be touched, and the taxes on liquors and dealers should be maintained unless as to such kinds of intoxicants as may be used in the arts and sciences or be made from fruits; but on this I do not now declare.

Turning now to sugar, let me say the amount of duty collected on sugar last year was in round numbers, \$56,500,000, being an increase of the previous year of \$6,000,000.

Sugar, sugar-candy, and molasses show an increase of exactly \$6,237,738 over the year before. Except iron, steel, and manufactures, it exceeds the increase of nearly all other articles combined, and the increase over iron, steel, and their manufactures is nearly \$200,000, so that it not only in and of itself presents the most striking inequality in point

of relation of annual amount of duty to home product, persons, and area protected, but it is the one as to which the annual income is most rapidly increasing.

This being the case, what should be done? I answer unhesitatingly, put sugar on the free-list and give a bounty equal to present rate of duty to all persons who shall produce in this country from canes or beets 500 pounds of good marketable sugar.

The question may be asked, do you favor a general system of bounty giving? I answer, no; but that whenever, as in this case, our home industries can be protected and new ones established and developed by giving a bounty I am in favor of giving it. Why, sir, as has already been shown in this debate, we can actually save \$50,000,000 each year and not in least jeopardize a single sugar plant in the land. If the sugar industry of the South had exhibited during all these years the power of growth, of expansion, promising extensive enlargement, as has and does manufacturing, and in that condition needed protection, I would probably regard the case on all fours with that interest. The cases are wholly dissimilar. There is one fact in connection with sugar manufacturing in this country well understood by members of this body, but not, in so far as I am aware, sufficiently emphasized in this debate.

As a nation we are, in my opinion, on the eve of a great and successful era of sugar manufacture from sorghum cane, if not from sugar-beets.

It has not been very many years since manufacturing sugar profitably from beets was regarded impracticable, but now the entire success of that method is attested by the more than 600,000 tons produce in Germany, over 460,000 tons in Austria, 400,000 tons in France, over 300,000 tons in Russia, and over 125,000 tons in Holland; so that to-day one-half of the sugar product of the world is made from beets.

During the past five years, and particularly during 1887, under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, such experiments have been made as fully justify the conclusion that sugar-making from sorghum cane as a profitable business is assured, and that a good article of sugar can be manufactured from cane grown in Kansas (and if in Kansas, then in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and other States) as profitably as from another quality of cane in Louisiana.

As gentlemen present know, there has recently been issued by the Commissioner of Agriculture a pamphlet containing in detail reports from the several chemists who during 1887 conducted experiments at sugar-making at Fort Scott, Kans., Rio Grande, N. J., and Lawrence, La.

This pamphlet contains also such an interesting "historical sketch" of the sorghum plant and the various attempts to demonstrate its adaptability to successful sugar production that I deem it of interest to present it, to be printed as a part of my remarks. It was prepared by Professor E. B. Cowgill, appointed by the secretary of the State board of agriculture of the State of Kansas to inspect and report upon sugar manufactured under an act of the Legislature of Kansas of date March 5, 1887, entitled "An act to encourage the manufacture of sugar," and appropriating \$15,000 to cover a bounty authorized by the act of 2 cents per pound upon all sugar manufactured in that State from "beets, sorghum, or other sugar-yielding canes or plants grown in Kansas."

The historical sketch is as follows:

The sorghum plant was introduced into the United States in 1853-'54 by the Patent Office, which then embraced all there was of the United States Department of Agriculture. Its juice was known to be sweet, and chemists were not long in discovering that it contained a considerable percentage of some substance giving the reactions of cane-sugar. The opinion that the reactions were due to cane-sugar received repeated confirmation in the formation of true cane-sugar crystals in sirups made from sorghum. Yet the small amounts that were crystallized, compared with the amounts present in the juices as shown by the analyses, led many to believe that the reactions were largely due to some other substance than cane-sugar.

EARLY INVESTIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

During the years 1878 to 1882, inclusive, while Dr. Peter Collier was chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, much attention was given to the study of sorghum juices from canes cultivated in the gardens of the Department at Washington. Dr. Collier became an enthusiastic believer in the future greatness of sorghum as a sugar-producing plant, and the extensive series of analyses published by him attracted much attention from sugar-makers in the South and students of the chemistry of sugar throughout the country.

SUGAR FACTORIES ERECTED IN KANSAS.

Stimulated by the analytical results published by Dr. Collier, interested parties erected large sugar factories and provided them with costly appliances. Hon. John Bennyworth erected one of these at Larned, in this State. S. A. Liebold & Co. subsequently erected one at Great Bend. Both of these factories made some sugar, both lost money, and both quit the business.

Sterling and Hutchinson followed with factories which made considerable amounts of merchantable sugar at no profit.

The factory at Sterling was erected by R. M. Sandys & Co., of New Orleans, who sought, by combining Mr. Sandys's thorough knowledge of sugar with the best practical skill of the South, to establish the sorghum-sugar industry on a proper basis. For two seasons this combination worked faithfully, and while the sirup produced paid the expenses of the factory, not a crystal of sugar was made. The factory then in 1883 changed hands and passed under the superintendency of Professor M. A. Scovell, then of Champaign, Ill., who, with Professor Webb, had worked out in the laboratories of the Illinois Industrial University a practical method for obtaining sugar from sorghum in quantities which at prices then prevalent would pay a profit on the business. But prices declined, and after making sugar for two years in succession the Sterling factory succumbed.

The Hutchinson factory at first made no sugar, but subsequently passed under the management of Professor M. Swenson, who had successfully made sugar in the laboratory of the University of Wisconsin. Large amounts of sugar were

made at a loss, and the Hutchinson factory closed its doors. In 1884 Hon. W. L. Parkinson fitted up a complete sugar factory at Ottawa and for two years made sugar at a loss. Mr. Parkinson was assisted during the first year by Dr. Wilcox, and during the second year by Professor Swenson.

INFORMATION GAINED.

Much valuable information was developed by the experience in these several factories, but the most important of all was the fact that with the best crushers the average extraction did not exceed half of the sugar contained in the cane. It was known to scientists and well-informed sugar-makers in this country that the process of diffusion was theoretically efficient for the extraction of sugar from plant cells, and that it had been successfully applied by the beet-sugar makers of Europe for this purpose.

FURTHER WORK OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

In 1883 Professor H. W. Wiley, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, made an exhaustive series of practical experiments in the laboratories of the Department on the extraction of the sugars from sorghum by the diffusion process. His report sums up the results of his experiments as follows:

"1. The extraction of at least 85 per cent. of the total sugars present was secured. In many of the experiments, as will be seen by consulting the table, scarcely a trace of sugar could be detected in the exhausted chips.

"2. The production of a quantity of melada represented by from 10.9 to 12.28 per cent. of the weight of the cane diffused.

"This was secured with a cane in which the total sugars did not exceed 11.68 per cent. The percentage of melada by this process will be found just about equal to the per cent. of total sugars in the cane.

"It ought to be greater with a more perfect extraction, but I am speaking only of results actually obtained.

"This yield is just about double that obtained by the large factories at Rio Grande, Campaign, and other places.

"3. The production of a juice of great purity, which lends itself easily to processes of depuration.

"I consider the experiments, however, to have their chief value in the fact that they will call the attention of cane-growers to the advantages which a rational system of diffusion will have over pressure in the extraction of the saccharine matter.

"I hope to be able at the end of another season to report further progress in this interesting problem.

"In the present condition of the sorghum-sugar industry, in which it has alike to be protected from the overzeal of its friends and the opposition of its enemies, the process of diffusion offers the most promising outlook for success. It therefore seems the duty of this division to make a more practical test of this process and on a larger scale."

To make the necessary further experiments with diffusion required the expenditure of large sums of money. As already shown, the private companies had lost heavily. They were utterly unable to complete the experiments so hopefully begun by the Department of Agriculture.

THE AID OF CONGRESS SOLICITED.

At this crisis Hon. W. L. Parkinson and Mr. Alfred Taylor, of Ottawa, Kans., after consulting with others interested in the then languishing sorghum-sugar industry, went to Washington to call the attention of Congress to the important results promised for the diffusion process, and to show that without the aid of an appropriation all that had hitherto been accomplished would be practically lost. The Kansas delegation in Congress became interested. Senator PLUMB made a thorough study of the entire subject, and, with the foresight of statesmanship, gave his energies to the work of securing an appropriation of \$50,000 for the development of the sugar industry. This appropriation was made during the last days of the session of 1884. The season was too far advanced to erect and use the diffusion apparatus with sorghum-cane, and it was by the Commissioner of Agriculture sent to Louisiana, and sorghum got no benefit from this first appropriation.

ANOTHER APPROPRIATION.

In 1855 Senator PLUMB, at the request of Judge Parkinson, Professor Swenson, and others, again labored for an appropriation for experiments with diffusion. It was shown by Judge Parkinson and all others interested in the sorghum-sugar industry that this was the only hope for success. Fifty thousand dollars for this purpose was again added to the agricultural appropriation bill, on the amendment of Senator PLUMB. This was expended at Ottawa, Kans., and in Louisiana. The report of the work at Ottawa closes as follows:

"1. By the process of diffusion 98 per cent. of the sugar in the cane was extracted, and the yield was fully double that obtained in the ordinary way.

"2. The difficulties to be overcome in the application of diffusion are wholly mechanical. With the apparatus on hand the following changes are necessary in order to be able to work 120 tons per day: (a) The diffusion cells should be made twice as large as they are now; that is, of 130 cubic feet capacity. (b) The opening through which the chips are discharged should be made as nearly as possible of the same area as a horizontal cross-section of the cell. (c) The forced feed of the cutters requires a few minor changes in order to prevent choking. (d) The apparatus for delivering the chips to the cells should be remodeled so as to dispense with the labor of one man.

"3. The process of carbonatation for the purification of the juice is the only method which will give a limpid juice with a minimum of waste and a maximum of purity.

"4. By a proper combination of diffusion and carbonatation the experiments have demonstrated that fully 95 per cent. of the sugar in the cane can be placed on the market either as dry sugar or molasses.

"5. It is highly important that the Department complete the experiments so successfully inaugurated by making the changes in the machinery mentioned above and by the erection of a complete carbonatation outfit.

"Respectfully,

"H. W. WILEY, Chemist."

But while so much had been accomplished by the joint efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Ottawa company, the financial results were so disastrous to the company as to leave them utterly unable to further cooperate with the Government in the prosecution of the work.

THE FORT SCOTT COMPANY ORGANIZED.

At this juncture Judge Parkinson saw that he must either submit to defeat or organize a new company to co-operate with the Department of Agriculture, should Congress be wise enough to make another appropriation. In this straight he went to Fort Scott and organized the Parkinson Sugar Company, which is now composed as follows: J. D. Hill, president; Eli Kearnes, vice-president; M. Swenson, secretary and chemist; W. Chénault, treasurer; W. L. Parkinson, manager; C. F. Drake, A. W. Walburn, W. W. Pusey, J. W. Converse, and David Richards.

Taking up the work where all others had failed, this company has taken a full share of the responsibilities and losses, until it has at last seen the Northern sugar industry made a financial success.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAKES AN APPROPRIATION.

The report of 1885 showed such favorable results that in 1886 the House made an appropriation of \$94,000, to be used in Louisiana, New Jersey, and Kansas. A new battery and complete carbonatation apparatus was erected at Fort Scott. About \$60,000 of the appropriation was expended here in experiments in diffusion and carbonatation.

In his report Dr. Wiley arrived at the following conclusions:

"In a general review of the work the most important point suggested is the absolute failure of the experiments to demonstrate the commercial practicability of manufacturing sorghum sugar. The causes of this failure have been pointed out in the preceding pages, and it will only be necessary here to recapitulate them. They were—

"1. Defective machinery for cutting the canes and for elevating and cleaning the chips, and for removing the exhausted chips.

"2. The deterioration of the cane, due to much of it becoming overripe, but chiefly to the fact that much time would generally elapse after the canes were cut before they reached the diffusion battery. The heavy frost which came the 1st of October also injured the cane somewhat, but not until ten days or two weeks after it occurred.

"3. The deteriorated cane caused a considerable inversion of the sucrose in the battery, an inversion which was increased by the delay in furnishing chips, thus causing the chips in the battery to remain exposed under pressure for a much longer time than was necessary. The mean time required for diffusing one cell was twenty-one minutes, three times as long as it should have been.

"4. The process of carbonation, as employed, secured a maximum yield of sugar, but failed to make a molasses which was marketable. This trouble arose from the small quantity of lime remaining in the filtered juices, causing a blackening of the sirup on concentration, and the failure of the cleaning apparatus to properly prepare the chips for diffusion."

THE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE DISCOURAGED.

After the expenditure of so much money, and the publication of so discouraging a report as that of 1886, the Commissioner of Agriculture declined to ask for further appropriations.* But Senator PLUMB again came to the rescue, and, by a faithful presentation of the possibilities of the case, induced Congress to make an appropriation of \$50,000, of which \$24,000 was apportioned to Louisiana, \$5,000 to Rio Grande, N. J., and \$20,000 to Fort Scott, Kans.†

SUCCESS AT LAST.

This year the Fort Scott management made careful selection of essential parts of the processes already used, omitted non-essential and cumbersome processes, availed themselves of all the experience of the past in this country, and secured a fresh infusion of experience from the beet-sugar factories of Germany, and attained the success which finally places sorghum-sugar making among the profitable industries of the country.

STATE ENCOURAGEMENT.

The State of Kansas had, by all reports, been indicated as the center of the sorghum-sugar industry when it should be developed. Kansas statesmen in the Legislature, as early as 1855, conceded that the State should assist in the development of the new industry. In that year Hon. R. F. Bond, member of the house from Rice County, prepared and introduced a bill providing for a bounty of 1½ cents per pound, to be paid out of the State treasury, on all sugar manufactured in the State for five years.

The bill awakened a great deal of enthusiasm, and at the same time a factious opposition, and was lost. At the session of 1857 Senator Bawden, of Bourbon County, introduced a bill providing for a bounty of 2 cents per pound to be paid upon all sugar manufactured in the State for five years, the maximum amount to be paid in any year being limited to \$15,000. This bill became a law.

It will thus be seen that the present condition of the sorghum-sugar industry is due to private enterprise, aided by Government and State appropriations, and directed by scientific and practical skill.

COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE LE DUC, LORING, AND COLMAN.

It should be mentioned in this connection that United States Commissioner of Agriculture Le Duc extended a strong and friendly hand to the sorghum-sugar industry during his term of office. His successor, Commissioner Loring, had the work continued by Professor Wiley, but was himself skeptical as to results. The present Commissioner, Hon. Norman J. Colman, had been an advocate of sorghum for many years before his accession to office, and had probably written and published more on the subject than any other man in the United States. Every friend of the struggling industry was gratified at his appointment. He has extended all the aid at his command, and may justly feel proud of the attainment of the present success under his administration of the Department of Agriculture.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE INDUSTRY.

The experiments in making sugar from sorghum, which, as above shown, have been in progress for several years at the expense of private capital and the United States Department of Agriculture, have this year reached so favorable results as to place the manufacture of sorghum sugar on the basis of a profitable business, as will be seen by the report to his company of Hon. W. L. Parkinson, manager of the Fort Scott works.

The success has been due to, first, the almost complete extraction of the sugars from the cane by the diffusion process; second, the prompt and proper treatment of the juice in defecating and evaporating; third, the efficient manner in which the sugar was boiled to grain in the strike pan.

On page 31 of said report the process of sugar-making from the sorghum cane as now developed is as follows:

First. The topped cane is delivered at the factory by the farmers who grow it.

Second. The cane is cut by a machine into pieces about 1½ inches long.

Third. The leaves and sheaths are separated from the cut cane by fanning-mills.

Fourth. The cleaned cane is cut into fine bits called chips.

Fifth. The chips are placed in iron tanks, and the sugar "diffused"—soaked out with hot water.

Sixth. The juice obtained by diffusion has its acids nearly or quite neutralized with milk of lime, and is heated and skimmed.

Seventh. The defecated or clarified juice is boiled to a semi-sirup in vacuum pans.

Eighth. The semi-sirup is boiled "to grain" in a high vacuum in the "strike-pan."

Ninth. The mixture of sugar and molasses from the strike-pan is passed through a mixing machine into centrifugal machines, which throw out the molasses and retain the sugar.

After a very full presentation in detail of facts relating to this manufacture, Professor Cowgill concluded his report, as follows:

There seems to be no doubt but that there is here developed an industry of vast importance to our State and nation. For the year ending June 30, 1886, there was consumed in the United States, foreign grown and manufactured, sugar amounting to 2,689,881,765 pounds. If two thousand new sugar factories were at once erected, and each should produce an annual product of one and a quarter million pounds of sugar, they would not supply the place of the sugars now imported.

*The non-action of the Commissioner is misunderstood by Mr. Cowgill. When the House Committee on Agriculture made the appropriation of the preceding year it was agreed that no subsequent grant should be demanded. It was in harmony with this agreement and not for the reasons stated, that the Commissioner did not ask for a further appropriation.

†The distribution of the money to the various stations was left to the discretion of the Commissioner, and was not mentioned in the bill.

The annual consumption of sugar per capita in the United States is about 56 pounds. The population of Kansas may be taken as 1,500,000. These people consume each year—56 by 1,500,000 equal 84,000,000 pounds of sugar. It will be safe to say that the annual average product of the factories will not exceed 1,500,000 pounds; so that fifty-six factories will be required to supply the sugar consumed by the present population of Kansas, and for which they pay over \$5,000,000 annually.

Processes whereby sugar can be made at a profit from sorghum have been worked out. These are far from perfect, but present developments give promise of others in the near future, and will enable us to produce our own sugar on our soil, with the labor of our people. Those who invest in the new industry will be cautious about experimenting with unknown conditions. Kansas is, therefore, likely to lead in the development and become the first Northern sugar State.

In view of these encouraging facts, who will venture to contradict when I make the prediction that within twenty years America will produce all the sugar her people consume. Why, then, should we hesitate to extend the reasonable aid of government to this new and wonderful industry? My own State, following the example of Kansas, has appropriated money to aid its development within her borders, and now, and in this presence, I declare myself ready to vote aid to the broader field—the entire country.

After disposing of sugar in this statesman-like manner, then let other articles on the dutiable list be carefully scanned with the view to a wise revision, and not a hasty destructive cutting and slashing at this or that article, as it may seem one section of the country may be able to slap the other in the face without being too seriously bruised in return. Let there be no boy's play about this matter, but a most careful, business-like consideration in broad daylight under the shining sun of noonday, and not in dark, impenetrable corners, within stone buildings carefully guarded against "the other side;" lest, perchance, the "tricks of the trade" be discovered.

Mr. Chairman, no person can more than touch here and there in one hour's discussion of the tariff. Numerous points of interest suggest themselves to my mind which I would like exceedingly to discuss. Many must necessarily be passed by in silence. I have noticed, however, that of the classes of people singled out in this discussion, the farmer, laboring man, and manufacturer are those receiving the most attention. The free-trader in profession is the devoted friend of the farmer, likewise of the laboring man. Oh, how he loves them! As the soul of Jonathan was knit to that of David, so, if you will let him tell it, is the soul of a free-trader knit to the farmer and laboring man; but these being thus knit together, according to the free-trader's imaginings, the manufacturer is the hated and detested Saul who is ever seeking to destroy them. I think I have shown how the Southern free-trader's soul in this case is "knit" to that of the farmer. The "knitting" is, in so far as every product of the farm is concerned, to the neglect of the farmer and pinning him to the free-list. Not in an open, frank, manly way, but by quietly dropping him out of sight as to practical benefits, while holding him up before him to smile upon and deceive, as matter of fact.

The manufacturer—that man or association of men engaged in lawful, honorable, and successful business, for whom every town or city East and West, and particularly in the West, is earnestly striving to have locate within the corporate limits, knowing well how much such enterprises properly conducted conduce to local prosperity and mutual business helpfulness—what a wretch is he in the eyes of his bitter foe, the free-trader!

Now, sir, there is one thing very patent to me in connection with the larger manufactories of whatsoever kind. Whatever the past, the time has come in the business history of this world when these extensive manufacturing interests can not be successfully carried on without putting together in the same enterprise large aggregations of capital. If it were possible to foresee events affecting any given industry, it can with truth be said that no man now so engaged could have been induced to thus subject his capital to the united purpose of a business if he could at the outset have seen not only that his reasonable annual accumulations might be uncertain, but that his capital would be exposed to certain loss, and no man or set of men now in any given manufacturing business will stay in it longer than they can not avoid, if it is certain they are not to make any money.

The success of all honorable, well-conducted business means the success of those immediately connected therewith as laborers and those engaged in other employments about them. So it is we of the West are laboring and planning to induce other gentlemen having money to come among us and build and operate enterprises that not only tend toward but do in fact enlarge the whole community's interests, and I am happy to say we are meeting with increasing success in this line. And let me say further that at the next census Iowa will surprise many of the incredulous in the growth of her manufacturing enterprises. The cities of that State, large and small, have been putting forth persistent efforts to secure capital from elsewhere than their immediate neighborhood to join with theirs in starting some new enterprise that should employ labor, and send forth blessings and good cheer not only, but add to the permanent property interests of those investing and the community. And I beg leave to cite one of the most striking illustrations of the success of this activity of our people.

In 1880 Sioux City had a population of 7,300. To-day she has over 30,000, and has witnessed a most marvelous growth and prosperity. How has this come? Not by accident. Not by waiting for the slow but sure development of the surrounding country alone. Mainly by

reason of the determination of her people to make Sioux City a financial, commercial, manufacturing railroad center, and with tireless energy and liberal donations of money and grounds her citizens have secured a large foundry, plow factory, vinegar works, bottling works, flouring mills, immense flax mills, and numerous other important industries, and finally, to cap all, in addition to an old and extensive pork factory, long in operation, during 1887 her citizens secured the location of four immense pork and beef establishments, two of which are now in operation, having already constructed large plants, one by Silverhorn, the other by Fowler Brothers, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, thus making Sioux City the largest meat center west of Chicago; and if any of you gentlemen who hear me are skeptical on this subject just make a trip to this rapidly-growing, only corn palace city of the world, and you will thereafter affirm the truthfulness of my statements.

With only two lines of railroad in 1870, she now has, with branches, ten, and others building. I tell you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, no gloomy picture of poverty-stricken farm life will fit that part of the country. Since 1879, the year of the last grasshopper appearance, thousands of farms have opened in Northwest Iowa on lands costing from \$4 to \$10 per acre, which, with reasonable improvements added, are now well worth \$20 to \$50 per acre, and, sir, I am proud of this opportunity to utter words of merited praise of that interesting prosperous section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed the free-trade taunt that our manufacturing are along the seaboard and away off from the farmers of the West, and therefore they might as well be across the ocean. Out upon such miserable nonsense as this!

While, as all know, the great institutions of trade, and especially to manufactures of cottons, woollens, etc., were early planted near the Atlantic, and that there the great bulk of them by the very reasonable law of the case will remain, yet he who will not cast his eye over the States of the West and see their growth in manufacture is blind beyond cure. You of the other side say we of the West can not have successful manufacture, and I say you do not know or else sadly pervert the facts. The whole great West is rapidly increasing in manufacture.

To illustrate this fact I have chosen Indiana, the smallest of Western States in area, having only 36,350 square miles gross area, and not the largest in point of manufacturing interests, Illinois being among the most important of the whole country.

In 1850 the mechanical and manufacturing establishments numbered 4,392; capital invested in them, \$7,750,402; hands employed, 14,440; amount paid in wages, \$3,728,844; value of materials, \$10,369,700; value of products, \$18,725,423.

And in 1880 the following magnificent increase was shown to exist: Number of establishments, 11,198; capital, \$65,742,962; hands employed, 69,504; amount paid in wages, \$21,960,838; value of materials, \$100,262,917; value of product, \$148,006,411.

Referring to the first biennial report (seventh volume) of the department of statistics for 1885 and 1886, on pages 24 and 25, after stating a table of statistics from which the above are taken, the author, William A. Peelle, jr., proceeds to say:

By consulting the foregoing table it will be seen that during the thirty years the number of establishments has increased 175 per cent.; capital, 828 per cent.; hands employed, 392 per cent.; total wages paid, 600 per cent.; value of material, 900 per cent.; value of products, 722 per cent. Since 1880 the increase has been steady and gratifying, and the sum totals, if they could be accurately obtained, would give to Indiana a proud prominence in the manufacturing industries of the country. It should be understood that the 11,198 establishments enumerated in the foregoing table do not include the mining operations of the State, nor those engaged in railroad work, other than car building and repairs. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the questions which directly relate to labor, and by which are meant those enterprises which employ working people at stipulated wages by the day, week, or month. Even in Indiana the question forms an interesting study, and when considered for the entire United States its importance is increased an hundred fold.

The following figures, taken from the reports already referred to, will give the reader an idea of the gigantic strides by which this interest has advanced in the United States in the past thirty years:

Years.	Establishments.	Capital invested.	Number of persons employed.
1850.....	123,025	\$533,245,351	957,659
1860.....	140,433	1,009,855,715	1,311,246
1870.....	252,148	2,118,208,769	2,053,996
1880.....	253,825	2,790,272,600	2,758,895

Years.	Amount of wages paid.	Value of materials.	Value of product.
1850.....	\$236,755,467	\$555,123,822	\$1,019,106,616
1860.....	378,878,966	1,001,605,092	1,885,861,676
1870.....	775,584,343	2,488,427,242	4,232,325,442
1880.....	947,953,795	3,896,823,549	5,369,579,191

It will be observed from the foregoing table that during the thirty years named the increase has been as follows: In establishments, 108 per cent.; in capital, 423 per cent.; in employes, 200 per cent.; in wages, 300 per cent.; in value of material, 500 per cent.; in product, 400 per cent. It will be gratifying to know that Indiana in manufacturing enterprises has kept abreast of the advancing

column of progress in such matters, and this may be readily seen in a recapitulation of the per cents. of growth in the United States and Indiana:

	Per cent. in United States.	Per cent. in Indiana.
Establishments.....	108	175
Capital invested.....	423	828
People employed.....	200	392
Wages paid.....	300	600
Value of material.....	500	900
Value of product.....	400	722

Such results as are shown by the foregoing figures are in the highest degree creditable to Indiana. They demonstrate that the people of the State are in active sympathy with the spirit of advancement and improvement abroad in the world, and that the State has taken a position in labor affairs which calls for a department as an adjunct to this bureau that shall be devoted entirely to the collection, compilation, and arrangement of labor statistics.

Among the establishments making up the grand total of 11,885 in 1886, were 73 agricultural; capital in grounds, buildings, and machinery, \$1,846,950; average number employes, 1,719; total annual wages, \$1,112,724; total value of manufactured product, \$5,147,135. Boots and shoes, 1,270 establishments; capital in building, etc., \$666,987; average number employes, 2,041; total wages, \$723,355; value manufactured goods per annum, \$1,800,830. Carriage manufacturers and shops, 238; capital in buildings, etc., \$821,455; average number employes, 1,613; value manufactured product, \$2,121,760; total annual wages paid, \$716,840. Drain tile establishments, 545; capital in buildings, etc., \$1,153,607; average number employes, 2,166; value annual product, \$1,751,045; total annual wages paid, \$497,609.

Furniture and cabinet shops, 236; capital in building, etc., \$2,919,010; average number employes, 5,729; value annual product, \$6,913,268; total paid for wages, \$2,423,865. Planing and saw mills combined, and saw-mills separate, 1,378; capital in building, etc., \$4,668,305; average number employes, 9,194; value annual product, \$14,333,319; total annual wages paid, \$2,460,848.

Wagon manufacturers, 289; capital in buildings, etc., \$1,223,533; average number employes, 2,286; value annual product, \$3,654,336; total paid for wages, \$869,350.

And lastly, of those I will take time to mention—but not by any means least—is woolen mills: Number, 52; capital in buildings, etc., \$1,167,802; average number employes, 2,038; annual value of product, \$3,052,730; total wages paid, \$869,359.

And, sir, I venture to say that when the census of 1890 is taken it will show a continuance of this same prosperity not only in the small State of Indiana, but extending over the entire West.

There are now fifty-two woolen mills in the State, producing over \$3,000,000 of goods annually and paying over \$600,000 in wages for the same period.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], in his effort to show the failure of protection, cited the decrease of woolen mills in the six New England States from 1870 to 1880, the decrease being one hundred and seventeen in number, but he had not one word in his whole speech about the growth of the West, not a word of Indiana's splendid development, not a word of Indiana's gratifying exhibit of manufacturing enterprise.

Ah, BYNUM! BYNUM! statesman from the West, tall of form and handsome of face, why, in your mad zeal to defend the fallacious theory of free trade, should you thus turn from and ignore the glorious facts of which your own Western section is the abundant possessor?

I say the West is coming to the front on this subject—not as rapidly as we from that part of the land would like, but surely coming, and the next census will reveal the truth of this statement.

Why, sir, Illinois has among her many and important manufacturing establishments five cotton manufactories. Four years ago a large and valuable one was constructed, and has since been operated, in Aurora, the home of the gentleman from that district, Mr. HOPKINS. I do not presume it has made much above expenses, but the last I knew of it it was operating and employing a considerable number of hands.

An authoritative report from these mills at Aurora, Ill., makes the following showing:

Date of construction.....	1884
Cost of plant.....	\$325,000.00
Capital in business.....	\$75,000.00
Number of hands employed.....	230
Wages paid annually.....	\$65,000.00
Value of annual output.....	\$350,000.00
Number of looms.....	424

Other mills of this kind will follow. At this time, in the city of Des Moines, ground is being broken for a large cotton-mill. The splendid condition of Iowa was well portrayed by my colleague [Governor GEAR] last week in his speech on this bill. None know better than he how grandly Iowa has developed. Ours is an agricultural people, and yet so much do we appreciate the value of a diversity of employments that most active efforts are being put forth to induce capital to come among us and build up enterprises that shall afford and promote labor. And while we are comparatively young in years, and particularly in manufacturing, we are not ashamed of our progress.

Last week Governor GEAR flung out before your gaze a pair of excellent Iowa-made woolen blankets, the product of a mill that is operating at some profit, I trust, away out in the West—in Iowa. And when the next discussion comes on upon this subject in 1890, in the Fifty-first Congress, he will no doubt ask you to examine a fine bolt of cotton manufactured at the capital of our State.

The exhibit we now make is by no means insignificant. Mechanical and manufacturing establishments, 6,921; capital invested, \$33,987,886; whole number employes, men, women, and youth, 28,354;

total amount paid in wages per year, \$9,725,962; value of material used, \$48,754,311.

Value annual products, \$71,045,926; of capital invested in woolen establishments, there is \$553,500; hands employed, 7,112; total annual wages paid, \$117,792. And before leaving Iowa permit me to say that her condition, in point of manufacturing interests, is one of infancy.

Unequal and iniquitous discriminations in freight charges more than anything else have retarded manufacturing in the West. With the amendments to the interstate-commerce law that are certain of realization, and the continued improvement in the matter of equitable administration of the railroad business of the country, let me tell all of you gentlemen that the West with its magnificent water-powers, its gold, silver, coal, iron, and other minerals, is going to have a future, grand and glorious. And the West is willing, yea anxious, to cooperate with the East and the South in every good word and work calculated to advance the welfare and prosperity of our entire land. All she asks is an even, fair chance with other sections of the land in the matter of cheapness and equity of transportation, not only for her products East, but for yours of the East and South in return; that the products of other sections of the land which she must have come to her borders bearing every legitimate and proper charge for every dollar of honest use of capital, compensation to laborers who handle them, and reasonable, necessary cost of transportation, but in no case and to no extent burdened with the inequity of a forced cost, the result of trusts and combines.

That which the West now most views with alarm is the disposition of moneyed men to conspire together to create unnatural and unjustifiable charges in retail establishments for articles they consume, while those from the farm must from the very nature of things always go to the markets free from any but the most reasonable and usual conditions and charges. Only when these products fall into the hands of capitalists can they be in the least manipulated, as oil, sugar, and numerous other necessary articles of consumption are now wickedly controlled by unconscionable financial pirates whose greed for gain is limited only by their inability to include the known world in their schemes of robbery.

If the West can be saved from the piracy of "trusts" and "combines," and have those natural conditions in other respects to which I have heretofore referred, she will maintain the reputation of the Western farmer and business man for thrift, energy, and business success.

Neither are Iowa farmers free-traders, no matter what they may be in Minnesota. At the last annual meeting of the Iowa State Grange the farmers spoke out in most positive tones on this question. I read part of their resolutions:

- Resolved, 1. That the time has arrived in the history of our State and nation when the farmers should unite for the protection of their rights and the promotion of their interests morally, socially, intellectually, and financially.
- 2. We demand such a revision of the tariff laws as will protect the producer as well as the manufacturer.
- 3. That that part of President Cleveland's message referring to the reduction of the tariff is a direct blow at the farmers of this country, and in favor of monopoly.
- 4. That a great reduction of the tariff on all raw material produced in this country would greatly embarrass the agriculturists, while it would not accomplish the object sought; namely, a reduction of the revenue.
- 5. That a reduction of the tariff on articles produced in this country will not reduce the revenue, but increase the surplus, and, therefore, depreciate the value of our produce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some remarks on the question of labor and laboring men, and I am done.

The Democratic party has no more of a monopoly of the fate and fortune of the laboring man than it has reputation for saving the Union from dismemberment. I grant that it never has armed itself against the former as it did against the latter; and, further than this, I am prepared to say it desires the best good of all the toilers of the land; but conceding this does not in the least argue that the Republican party has not been deeply concerned about the welfare of this class. No man having regard for truth can say that this party has neglected those whose days and nights are too heavily weighted with burdens we would all see lightened. The faith of the Republican party has ever been, and is, that the wisest national policy is the one that will afford to our toiling masses the most varied fields of employment; that will strengthen all forms of existing industry and constantly build up new ones; that as the West settles and develops every new enterprise possible of successful operation shall be brought into being, and thus aid most materially in fostering and sustaining her great distinguishing industry—the farm.

The Democratic party charges that we Republicans protect everything but labor, thus flatly contradicting a settled economic principle

that labor and capital are inseparably connected with the other. We aim by making it possible for capital to find profitable investment to assure labor of healthful occupation, knowing that no profit can come to capital anywhere unless it call labor to its side and engage its assistance.

But have we not favored the protection of labor in other ways? Has not the Republican party indicated its desire to further protect labor by enacting legislation seeking to curtail Chinese immigration and joining the Democrats in prohibiting so-called contract labor? Most certainly.

And now, Mr. Chairman, one more point upon this question of our duty to our laboring classes, and I will close. The conditions of the crowded Old World with its dense population ought ere this to have aroused the statesmanship of America to a solemn duty not yet performed, and I fear not yet fully appreciated. It is maintained that when our population in all parts of this country shall be as numerous as theirs, we will be in their condition as to poverty and wretchedness of her dependent millions. I can not say it may not be so; at least, I fear it will come painfully near being so. Is there nothing, then, the Congress of the United States may do to postpone that day to the farthest limit possible? In all this debate, in so far as I have been able to attend upon it, not a word is remembered calling attention to the unrestricted immigration now and for years flowing in upon us from nearly every country on the other hemisphere. And what a spectacle it is. Why, sir, think of it. Over 471,000 upon an average each year received to these shores during the past eight years, and on they come and will come unceasingly, unless the Congress of the United States takes action to prevent.

I am aware sir, that this is a delicate question, one likely to provoke discussion, and perhaps unfriendly criticism in our respective districts, but in reflecting on the condition of labor now and of its probable future in this country, I have been led to the decided conviction that it is the duty of this Government to give serious and timely attention to this matter. Can we, in the very nature of things, permit this tremendous influx of people and not expect the most serious consequences to the whole country?

I am not speaking now as one alarmed because of a spirit of anarchy here and there in the land, for it appears to me the majesty of the law of Illinois has pretty effectually discouraged the violence of anarchy, if not the thing itself. Have we room for the born and unborn millions of Europe and Asia? No thoughtful person will say we have, but all will agree that some day a barrier must be raised. But when? Why not commence to deliberate earnestly about it now, and act? It is not yet too late. We still have room for all now within our borders, from whatsoever clime they have come, unless it be John Chinaman. He must go—i. e. if we have the power to make him—or he must, if away, remain; but all the rest of earth may come. Oh, the bald inconsistency of such a position!

Mr. Chairman, in a sense we are all foreigners, and in another I profoundly trust we are all Americans. It is our duty, as it should be our pleasure, to legislate for the benefit of our whole population, no matter whence they have come or whither they may go.

I would ask no question of any now here—whence came you—what your nationality or religion; but I would propound questions and insist on truthful answers of the untold millions yet to come, unless prohibited so doing.

It is a most difficult problem, I know, in the face of our unbroken history; but certain it is the common good—the welfare and prosperity of those who are designated as foreigners, their children and children's children—demands that the present rate of immigration should be at no distant day largely curtailed; and the statesman—be he Democrat or Republican—who shall successfully, and upon the fairest, most humane, and patriotic basis, propose and carry into effect legislation satisfactory to the American people, will have done his country a service of which his children may well be proud.

In order to bring to the minds of the members of this House the solemn facts with which we have to deal, I submit herewith tables found in the quarterly report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, No. 2, 1887-'88, bearing on the numbers and nationalities of those who compose the immense number of people who are coming to us annually from other lands.

Shall we drift along years to come in a sense of security from the dangers of an overcrowded, unemployed population, or shall we, in a spirit of "charity to all and malice toward none," seek in this great question the ultimate good of every man, woman, and child in our great and beneficent Republic?

Statement showing the number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States during each year ending Dec. 31, from 1873 to 1887—inclusive.

Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
1 England	69,600	43,396	30,040	21,051	18,122	19,581	40,997	64,190	76,547	70,893	61,432	53,270	44,710	58,422	83,096
2 Ireland	75,848	47,688	29,969	16,506	13,791	17,113	27,651	84,799	70,909	72,937	83,654	58,589	49,793	52,912	72,888
3 Scotland	13,008	8,765	5,739	4,383	3,408	3,700	8,728	14,495	16,451	15,957	10,839	8,791	10,174	13,916	22,067
4 Wales	868	558	419	294	232	311	1,046	948	1,316	1,633	1,430	1,011	931	1,343	1,614
5 Great Britain, not specified.	31	15	12	9	1	1	2	6	7	8	6	95	2	8	4
Total Great Britain and Ireland.....	159,355	100,422	66,179	42,243	35,554	40,706	78,424	164,438	165,230	161,428	157,361	121,756	105,610	126,601	179,609

Number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States, from 1873 to 1887, inclusive—Continued.

Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
6 Austria.....	6,943	6,891	6,039	6,047	4,376	4,881	6,259	18,252	21,437	18,315	17,928	20,688	16,456	22,006	24,786
7 Belgium.....	1,306	705	623	454	367	454	753	1,484	1,939	1,129	1,673	1,722	1,363	1,641	2,987
8 Denmark.....	5,095	3,188	1,951	1,624	1,617	2,688	3,532	8,778	8,951	12,769	9,747	7,633	5,870	6,634	9,305
9 France.....	10,813	8,741	8,607	6,723	5,127	4,668	4,121	4,939	5,653	5,560	4,016	3,690	3,138	4,085	5,604
10 Germany.....	133,141	56,927	36,965	31,323	27,417	31,958	43,531	134,040	249,572	232,269	184,389	155,529	107,668	86,301	111,324
11 Gibraltar.....	8	5	4	16	1	2	17	4	4	7	7	11	8
12 Greece.....	37	20	27	24	18	13	23	22	17	177	25	56	171	106	509
13 Hungary.....	892	852	747	475	540	632	1,518	6,668	6,756	11,602	12,308	10,708	9,181	18,110	14,301
14 Italy (Continental).....	7,473	5,787	3,315	2,862	3,610	5,163	9,027	12,756	20,101	29,349	29,512	14,441	15,480	30,472	46,185
Italy (Insular):															
15 Sardinia.....	8	1	1	75
16 Sicily.....	34	72	29	116	48	228	14	25	2	13	25	52	5	93	71
Islands of the Mediterranean:															
17 Corsica.....	1	1	1	1	1	2
18 Crete.....
19 Malta.....	4	10	5	2	7	1	2	1	4	4	8	1	19
20 Netherlands.....	4,640	1,532	1,073	709	572	652	1,199	3,730	10,812	7,880	4,926	3,731	2,499	2,667	5,276
21 Norway.....	18,107	6,581	4,465	6,031	4,333	5,216	9,488	23,054	26,997	27,197	21,295	13,906	11,692	13,859	18,322
22 Sweden.....	11,351	4,336	6,031	5,204	4,774	6,176	16,659	46,723	55,892	60,413	32,596	24,017	21,508	32,222	51,236
23 Portugal.....	34	52	1,212	816	552	618	570	161	59	89	650	186	593	71	108
24 Roumania.....	15	55	81	116	781	301	2,204	635
25 Russia.....	3,490	7,447	4,369	6,787	3,370	4,216	3,784	5,278	8,193	17,497	6,907	15,122	16,517	25,980	23,521
26 Finland.....	113	4	23	21	8	22	10	247	320	708	1,107	407	434	810	2,294
27 Poland.....	2,863	1,449	707	854	320	554	876	2,488	6,283	4,246	2,151	4,369	3,101	6,396	4,900
28 Spain.....	486	571	529	597	542	432	534	420	405	328	245	334	310	452	483
29 Switzerland.....	3,223	2,436	1,641	1,572	1,612	2,051	3,834	8,498	11,628	11,839	11,433	8,215	5,126	4,518	6,501
30 Turkey in Europe.....	78	21	36	46	25	23	34	62	50	118	80	187	155	178	171
31 Heligoland.....	2
Total all other Europe.....	210,131	107,637	77,909	72,305	59,237	70,676	105,787	277,658	435,101	441,658	341,156	285,850	221,592	258,847	328,651
Total Europe.....	369,486	208,059	144,178	114,548	94,791	111,382	184,211	442,096	600,331	603,086	498,497	407,606	327,202	385,448	508,260
32 Arabia.....	13	1	1	8	4	12	6	69	28	7	32
33 Argenia.....	2	4	1	1	16	10	5	30	27	13	59	93
34 Burmah.....	9	2
35 China.....	18,154	16,651	19,033	16,879	10,379	8,468	9,189	7,011	20,711	35,614	381	84	57	8	28
36 India.....	22	15	15	22	17	9	15	39	14	12	5	30	25	14	35
37 Japan.....	25	4	3	6	4	1	7	7	8	3	38	39	154	168	269
38 Persia.....	7	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	3	4	2
39 Syria.....	1	1	1	10	39	9	44	39
40 Asia, not specified.....	10	82	30	113	5	1	4	6	26	10	82	59	23	23	331
Total Asia.....	18,221	16,704	19,088	17,055	10,407	8,518	9,218	7,098	20,775	35,657	542	311	304	323	762
41 Algeria.....	3	2	2	9	1	1	2	5	14	2	3	41
42 Egypt.....	4	8	3	3	1	3	4	41	8	8	2	35	8
43 Liberia.....	19	14	1	7	2	7	1	43
44 Morocco.....	2	3	2	1	3	4	2	1
45 South Africa.....	2	1	6	7	1	3	11	1	4	1	2	1
46 Africa, not specified.....	4	7	1	17	5	4	10	5	7	12	6	18	10	9	21
Total Africa.....	13	22	31	43	6	15	16	10	37	70	9	30	33	52	31
47 Quebec and Ontario.....	22,242	23,744	18,490	15,545	15,591	24,533	40,883	112,712	76,971	68,141	54,105	39,985	47
48 Manitoba.....	446	1,163	1,398	1,143	524	48
49 Nova Scotia.....	4,453	3,970	2,555	3,200	4,206	3,282	6,425	17,870	12,425	12,693	6,435	5,103	49
50 New Brunswick.....	1,346	1,867	1,119	1,494	1,215	1,458	3,811	5,929	2,006	2,400	2,150	1,239	50
51 Prince Edward Island.....	1,780	435	811	437	488	349	1,144	1,722	1,643	1,523	644	201	51
52 British Columbia.....	282	446	839	484	553	372	842	782	611	427	2,300	164	52
53 Newfoundland and Labrador.....	405	134	106	58	68	108	162	300	274	322	173	182	292	53
Total British North American Possessions.....	29,588	30,596	23,420	21,218	22,121	30,162	53,267	139,761	95,188	80,909	66,950	47,888	a292	(a)	(a)
54 Mexico.....	473	442	682	532	478	473	550	437	244	532	411	381	(a)	(a)	(a)
55 British Honduras.....	11	1	7	4	1	41	8	2	14	4	4	55
56 Costa Rica.....	3	1	1	56
57 Guatemala.....	1	1	1	3	4	1	57
58 Central America, not specified.....	34	9	9	13	25	14	21	1	24	3	12	23	7	32	41
Total Central America.....	34	21	14	14	36	18	27	42	33	5	26	23	11	36	41
59 Argentine Republic.....	9	1	7	6	4	2	5	1	9	3	4	12	2	9
60 Brazil.....	37	29	27	28	10	11	26	21	17	20	26	13	8	23	20
61 Chili.....	17	12	21	20	2	2	1	4	1	3	2	8	10
62 Ecuador.....	2	2	62
63 Guiana.....	27	6	7	3	4	2	1	7	3	17	12	2	9	63
64 Peru.....	8	17	10	11	19	17	8	1	4	5	1	64
65 United States of Colombia.....	35	23	22	20	31	7	23	27	22	5	9	4	9	369	248
66 Venezuela.....	23	20	34	37	14	16	9	51	16	24	11	27	10	20	46
67 South America, not specified.....	12	19	11	8	4	6	19	3	18	7	2	14	1
Total South America.....	168	129	139	135	78	61	90	119	85	88	67	50	51	436	342
68 Antigua.....	3	1	1	2	5	12	3	11	13	3
69 Bahamas.....	82	435	400	559	248	289	361	297	415	424	311	394	341	35	62
70 Barbadoes.....	50	84	42	32	25	22	18	33	24	6	9	21	5	26
71 Cuba.....	1,080	1,147	899	880	614	494	898	1,406	418	773	987	1,341	1,191	2,961	3,477
72 Curacoa.....	5	1	3	14	1	1	3	1	3	4	2	2	8	11
73 Guadeloupe.....	7	2	1	2	73
74 Hayti.....	16	27	2	10	21	4	24	35	12	1	2	5	12	27	74
75 Jamaica.....	30	28	32	23	41	34	17	21	53	22	6	23	18	67	75
76 Martinique.....	1	7	5	9	1	76
77 Nevis.....	3	3	2	1	1	77
78 Porto Rico.....	28	21	32	17	5	13	10	37	20	12	12	28	9	17	44
79 Saint Croix.....	47	23	12	4	17	11	7	7	17	34	13	10	28	12	18
80 Saint Thomas.....	1	5	15	9	18	5	7	2	2	2	1	4	3
81 Trinidad.....	3	4	4	4	7	6	2	5	6	2	2	1	6
82 West Indies, not specified.....	629	14	20	13	26	30	24	37	33	77	87	29	290	713	778
Total West Indies.....	1,974	1,749	1,530	1,568	1,010	923	1,312	1,806	1,009	1,394	1,438	2,138	2,721	3,835	4,478
Total America.....	32,157	32,937	25,785	23,467	23,723	31,577	55,246	142,225	96,559	88,928	68,892	50,480	3,075	4,307	4,861

* The arrivals of immigrants from the Dominion of Canada and from Mexico, since July 1, 1885, are excluded from all tables of immigration, it being impracticable to collect statistics of immigration across our frontiers by railway cars and other land vehicles.

Number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States, from 1873 to 1887, inclusive—Continued.

Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
83 Azores.....	1,397	1,262	980	906	791	873	741	682	1,225	1,457	1,276	1,755	823	1,206	1,298
84 Bermudas.....	45	61	21	29	18	13	6	29	40	61	19	55	28	8	2
85 Canary Islands.....		16	2	2	3	3	2		1						
86 Cape Verde.....	27	36	1	48		6		1	21	15	27	48	50	66	14
87 Madeira.....	3	1	7	2		1	1	1							
88 Saint Helena.....		3	1	2	1		1	3							
89 Atlantic islands, not specified.....											14	3	9	13	11
Total islands of the Atlantic.....	1,472	1,379	1,021	989	813	896	751	716	1,287	1,533	1,336	1,861	910	1,293	1,325
90 Australia.....	863	1,224	941	1,257	743	634	834	1,122	904	947	427	542	400	579	528
91 Hawaiian Islands.....	134	210	133	20		1	2	2		5	284	420	345	674	1,088
92 New Zealand.....	10	3	5	4	2		1		1	2	1	4	3	1	5
93 Society Islands.....	43	29							1						
94 Pacific islands, not specified.....		1	1					1	4	3				14	9
Total islands of the Pacific.....	1,050	1,467	1,080	1,281	745	635	837	1,125	910	957	712	966	748	1,268	1,630
95 Greenland, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands.....	4	182	11	30	1	163	252	348	31	36	251	9	29	147	5
96 Countries not stated.....	4	3	2	4		1		1							
97 Born at sea.....	138	61	35	23	16	15	34	81	105	82	77	83	60	49	59
98 Picked up at sea.....								3	10						
Total all other countries.....	146	246	48	57	17	184	286	433	146	118	328	92	89	196	64

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for taking a portion of the time set apart for the discussion of the bill now under consideration, in the subject-matter of which the people whom I have the honor to represent on this floor are so much interested.

Sir, the question of taxation is one of the first importance in every system of government, and its adjustment upon a proper basis and in proper degree, suited to the exercise of freedom and to the material prosperity of the citizen, is one of the greatest responsibilities of legislation. Especially is this so in a free Republic like ours, where all sovereignty abides with the people, and the officials of the Government, from the highest to the lowest, are but the servants or agents, if you please, of the people, intrusted for a limited time with the conduct of public affairs.

The unnecessary exercise of the taxing power robs the pocket of the citizen of more than is sufficient for the necessities of Government, and becomes an engine of oppression, which, in the hands of tyrants, is frequently the lever power for uprooting free institutions by gradual encroachment upon the rights of the people; and is a baneful influence in the extravagance and corruption which it engenders, and the constant temptation to wrong growing out of an overflowing Treasury.

The founders of government, and all those who come in the course of time to the enjoyment of its blessings, expect to be required to pay into the common fund their proportionate part of the taxes necessary for its economical and honest administration; but when we go beyond this, and persist for years and years in collecting for each year millions of money more than is necessary for the expenses of government, extravagant as they may be, we justly incur the indignation of an outraged people. That there is too much money collected by our different systems of taxation no one can deny, though some would, I believe, if the record did not stare them in the face with such an indisputable array of facts and figures; therefore, what to lop off and where to reduce should be the only matters of inquiry in the mind of any patriot who sits here as a representative of the American people. Partisan feeling should not enter into this inquiry, and the legitimate questions growing out of this bill should be considered purely as a most serious and important business proposition in which the welfare of the whole people whom we represent is involved.

It does no good to call each other hard names, nor is it profitable to recite the events of a quarter of a century and more ago, unless they bear upon the situation of our present duties and difficulties, and even then such references should be made in a manner not to arouse unpleasant feeling.

I know there are difficulties among those who sit on this side of the House as to the plan of reduction, the specific articles that should be included in it, and the limit to which it should extend as to each. I have no doubt but that, to some extent at least, the same differences exist on the opposite side of the House; therefore we should bear in mind that in the consideration of questions of this character, involving such diverse interests and matters of diverse opinion, conclusions are almost invariably reached through the medium of concession.

I have listened, sir, with a great deal of interest and, I trust, profit to the discussion as far as it has gone. The agitation of this most important question will certainly do good, and I think, sir, that I "can read between the lines" that ere long much that is useless and oppressive will be abolished and the means for raising revenue will be settled upon a business basis; not for the purpose of favoring monopolies; not to protect and enrich the few at the expense of the many, and they the poorer classes, but for the purpose solely of raising revenue sufficient for the necessary expenditures of the Government, and that, too, so as to distribute the burden in accordance with the ability to bear. It may

not be done now, but the people are aroused, and they will and should be heard.

They demand, sir, that their money shall not be taken and locked up to be kept from the circulation that they so much need, or squandered in extravagant appropriations to pampered jobs, only to be again rapidly collected by the same system, to be again squandered. It is as impossible under the present system of revenue to maintain the circulation to the requisite standard for the needs of commerce and trade as it is for an eel to sustain life by continually swallowing himself.

Sir, we have too much revenue and too many systems of revenue. Strike down that which is effete and has been permitted to remain beyond the period of its allotted time, and give vital force and energy to that which since the organization of this Government has been established and maintained as the true source of Federal revenue.

It is not my purpose, sir, to enter into a minute discussion of the details of the present tariff laws or the proposed changes therein. The whole field has been gone over time and again in its discussion, and there are other gentlemen yet to speak to whom the whole country will look for information, who, it is expected, will deal principally with this part of our revenue system. But, sir, there is another branch of our revenue system to which I wish to pay my respects before I am done. To do this in order I wish to state that I understand it to be conceded on all sides that a revision of the tariff, not by increasing the free-list, but by reducing the tax on imported goods to the true revenue basis, which is to the point that foreign manufacturers will be able to pay and bring in their goods and commodities and exchange them for our goods and commodities, would very much increase the revenue now raised by the tariff; and I believe it is generally conceded that sufficient revenue can by this means be raised by the tariff alone for all the necessary expenses of Government.

I know that the argument was made by members on both sides of this House, in discussing the question of a reduction of the surplus in the Treasury in the Forty-ninth Congress, that, by a reduction of the duty on foreign goods or importations, you thereby would increase the surplus. If so, and it stands to reason that it is so, why not make the reduction of the tariff to a business basis and repeal the odious internal-revenue laws?

Impost duty or customs, which is but another name for tariff, in order to amount to a protective tariff must be and is so high as greatly to retard or prohibit the introduction of foreign goods and commodities, thus "protecting" those who produce these goods and commodities here from foreign competition, and thereby preventing a lowering of the price to the consumer. Now, however necessary to the fostering of our manufacturing interests this course may have been in the earlier days of our history, that time has long since passed, and the American manufacturers of to-day compete most successfully with the world in anything that it is profitable from natural causes to manufacture here, so that having the competition shut off from abroad by a very high protective tariff, they combine together here in "trusts" and "pools," which are nothing more than an agreement that they will not sell any given article or class of articles for less than a certain price in order to prevent competition among themselves, and thus, notwithstanding the increase of manufacturing interests, they keep up fictitious values at a high protective standard.

And it is a fact in the current history of trade that when, as frequently occurs, there is an overproduction of manufactures here the excess of goods is conveyed to foreign countries and sold at greatly reduced prices than they are offered for here, thus showing that protection for the sake of protecting has ceased to be necessary to the interests of our manufacturers, and that a tariff for revenue for the sake of reve-

nue, affording them the benefit of the revenue-tariff tax, would be sufficient.

Placing articles on the free-list does not always benefit the consumer here, and especially is this so when the articles are not produced in this country at all, for it sometimes is taken advantage of by the foreign countries producing the article to place on it a moderate export tax whereby the consumer, instead of paying a moderate tariff tax into our own Treasury, is paying a moderate export tax into the treasury of the foreign country. A healthy tariff tax, one that will admit of foreign trade and intercourse and thereby extend the markets of our own products to the world, and at the same time pay a revenue into the Treasury, is what we need. I am, sir, in favor of a tariff for revenue only, and revenue only by the tariff. I am not now and never expect to be a free-trader. Abolish the internal-revenue tax and system, and address ourselves to the tariff in a businesslike way, knowing that we have to raise revenue enough to answer the needs of the Government, and it can be easily done.

Whilst we are arranging this, if there should be any deficiency, we certainly have surplus enough in the Treasury to temporarily answer that, and if it should be necessary to supplement the revenue received by the tariff, then, sir, the most just plan and the least vexatious is to place the additional burden where it will be easiest borne—upon incomes. The burden of a protective tariff falls upon the consumers, who are for the most part poor people who earn their livelihood by labor, many of them toiling in the fields to make the very staple used in the factories, and the price of which is regulated by a foreign market. If our chief industries are still in their "infancy" they have been dwarfed by protection. Give them the fresh, stirring air of American liberty to spread and try their strength in exercise with other industries of like nature, and they will become more self-reliant, and the generous health that competition—which is truly said to be "the life of trade"—will infuse into them will extend through all branches of our industries, including the noblest and most essential of all, that of those who under burning suns "make their bread by the sweat of their brows," and upon whose labor government itself depends; without which neither church nor state can prosper, and the "infant industries," of which we hear so much talk, one and all, could not budge a spindle. What protection have the farming class but in the labor of their own strong arms?

Ah, sir, when we hear talk of labor here it is not the labor that fells the forests and converts waste lands into fertile fields and pastures. We hear nothing of the labor that turns the clods, but it is always the labor of the loom and the labor of the shops, labor on Government contracts, on the railroads, in the mines, and everywhere that is to be tenderly cared and legislated for, but not the labor that with sun-browned hands plows and digs the fields, making not only the staple and the bread and meats that clothes and feeds himself and family, but the staple and the bread and meat that clothes and feeds us all.

There is no protection for that class of labor; yet upon its massive and good-natured shoulders rests the burden of the world. "Infant industries" indeed! Ah, sir, there are other "infants" in this land that claim some "protection;" and these are the little rosy-cheeked cherubs with sunny hair and bright, sparkling eyes, that wear the little white and pink dresses and make glad the heart of the father as he returns from the fields. Let us lessen taxation and increase the circulation of money and its more equal distribution for their benefit. This—the scarcity of money—is an important question, as I believe, growing out of the present condition of the revenue laws; and they are responsible, in great measure, for the stringency of money matters for several years past and now. A rich and overflowing Treasury, sir, makes a poor people, whether the unnecessary taxes be levied and collected off of what are termed "luxuries" or "necessities" of life, for it takes money to pay taxes, and all money withdrawn from the people in this way leaves that much less for the payment of debts and the ordinary transaction of business, and this, sir, in my opinion, is the true cause of the hard times of which we hear, and justly hear, so much complaint.

And another result concomitant with this and growing out of the protective system of taxation, are the complaints of the wage-earners—the employés of the combinations of capital, which under this system easily control the money and markets of the whole country. They appreciate the advantage of the protective system to the employer in the increased profits of the business, and clamor for a share of the profits in increase of wages. Strikes and riots are the result, shaking the peace of communities and damming up the channels of commerce. The intelligent laborer sees the inequality of a system that protects wealth and leaves poverty naked; and so long as this system of taxation is maintained for protection and colossal fortunes are realized to the protected, with a rapidity that rivals the story of the wonderful power of Aladdin's lamp, out of the interests thus protected, and by the labor of the toiling millions of poor laborers of both sexes, so long will this feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction continue, and strikes and riots multiply until hydra-headed anarchy, crouching in the weeds of corruption and fostered by a system which tends to make the rich richer

and the poor poorer, will at last threaten the very vitals of Government and the liberties of the people with its poisonous fangs.

Sir, it is high time to call a halt. Go look at the money-bags hoarded up under this double-barreled system of revenue in the building that stands at the other end of the avenue! See the returns for a day: and that to-day: \$575,236 from customs, \$948,768 from internal revenue. Look at the statement of the amount for the last month: Customs, \$17,202,374.59, and from internal revenue for same period, \$9,893,649.03, and of the amount on hand, and realize that this is drawn from the legitimate profits of labor, and ask yourself the question, if it is not wonderful that the people are so patient. Hard times in this country? Why should this exist? A soil more fruitful and diversified, a climate more beneficent, a people more industrious and naturally intelligent can not be found anywhere on the face of the earth. There are no natural causes for prolonged hard times, and they must exist from abnormal causes somewhere in the body-politic. We are now feeling about the root of the evil; let us have the manhood to pluck it up, root and branch, and leave the surplus where it belongs—in the pockets of the people.

Does New England need to be "protected" longer from Old England? Why, put her on her mettle and make her throw off her swaddling clothes of "over-grown infancy," and she can beat England at her own game. The South and West might with more propriety call for a protective tariff, if such measure were constitutional, against New England, but with our advantage in the South of having our factories in the midst of the cotton-fields, I think all the protection we need is that contemplated by the Constitution—a tariff for revenue.

The amount of the tariff is paid by the importer, be he a foreigner or one of our own citizens. Now, there is scarcely any one so simple as to suppose that the importer buys the goods abroad and brings them here at his own expense, and pays the tariff as a gratuity for the benefit of the consumer, who finally buys the goods and consumes or wears them out, though there are some who endeavor to gull the people by making this argument, and ask with great gusto: "Who pays any tariff? Mr. Jones, do you pay any tariff? Mr. Smith, does any marshal or sheriff in this country collect any tariff of you? No, sir! the rich importer pays the tariff." Then you should ask him this question: "Do you pay any freight on the goods you buy at the store? Does the merchant when he makes out your bill, make a charge of so much for freight, or does the sheriff come around and collect the freight? No, sir; the rich merchant pays the freight."

But how long do you suppose the merchant would hold up if when he comes to marking and pricing his goods to you as a customer he took no account of the cost of laying them down at his store? We know from experience that the merchant charges for the cost of carriage by steam-boat, by railroad, and by wagon and team in the price he asks for the goods, for it is as much a part of the cost to him as the original cost of the goods, and the consumer, be he farmer, mechanic, lawyer, doctor, or preacher, pays the freight when he buys the goods to use, and it is just so with the tariff.

For instance, a man buys goods in New York or Baltimore and offers them for sale in any town in my State; does not any one know that he adds in the cost of bringing goods from where they are first bought to the point where he offers them for sale, and that it is just as much a part of the cost to him as if it had been a part of the first price paid for the goods, and that putting this to the first cost he adds his own per cent., and that the customer pays it all when he pays for the goods? So that to say that the importer pays the tax and not the people who buy the goods is an attempt to deceive. The tariff is as much a tax upon the consumer as if it was levied upon his property and collected out of it. It is simply one of the modes of raising revenue, one of the modes of taxation, and to my mind, as we have to support and pay taxes to General Government in some way, I prefer the mode by the tariff to that of any other, provided it is adjusted, as any tax should be, solely for the purpose of raising revenue, and not for the purpose of keeping out commerce and revenue, fostering monopolies, and rendering possible "pools" and "trusts," and thereby making necessary the extraordinary mode of internal-revenue taxes.

It is true that good men of both parties differ on this question, just as they do on many other questions that arise from time to time as the exigencies of public affairs may bring forth. For instance, the currency question, as to whether we shall have a suspension of the coinage of silver, or as to whether we shall have the one standard, and that of gold, instead of the two—gold and silver; whether we shall have national-bank money or only Treasury notes, or whether we shall abolish both and return to the old State-bank system had before the war, and good men and good Democrats may hold their old opinions on all such questions and still be good Democrats, as ascertained by that touchstone of principles contained in the first inaugural of the great and immortal Jefferson, the founder of our party, and to whose writings and teachings we would all do well to recur occasionally. The cardinal principles of Democracy are deeper, broader, stronger, and more inflexible than any of these questions. The former exist like a rule of right for all time and under all circumstances; the latter must of necessity change and accommodate themselves to the exigencies of the times for which they

may be provided. What I understand to be the cardinal principles of Democracy are so beautifully and succinctly stated by Mr. Jefferson in his first inaugural that it will not be amiss for me to quote them here:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected.

And he concludes then with this beautiful commentary:

They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Now, sir; the man who receives this faith and keeps it will prove his faith by his works and vote the Democratic ticket, for these are the essentials, the very life, soul, and blood of the body, and all other questions are subordinate thereto.

There are many other pages in the writings of this great statesman that are profitable reading now. He came to his administration in times not unlike these. It was after the great struggle of the Revolution and at a time when the country, involved in the debt incident to the war and the other expenses of government, had resorted to the duplex system of revenue which we have now, tariff and internal revenue.

When Mr. Jefferson came to the administration of public affairs quite a surplus for the times had gathered in the Treasury and continued to increase. The same complaints existed among the people that we now hear and have heard so long of the vexatious, oppressive, and obnoxious internal-revenue laws. What, under these circumstances, do we find among the first utterances of this great man with a heart always big with sympathy for the people, with a mind fully imbued with the causes which led to the great struggle for independence, the principles of our Constitution and Government, that he had so large a share in framing, and with a desire to maintain the freedom and liberties of the citizen in all his domestic and State affairs without unnecessary interference on the part of the General Government.

We find in his first annual message to Congress these words:

Other circumstances combined with the increase of numbers have produced an augmentation of revenue arising from consumption in a ratio far beyond that of population alone, and, though the changes of foreign relations now taking place so desirably for the world may for a season affect this branch of revenue, yet, weighing all probabilities of expense as well as of income, there is reasonable ground of confidence that we may safely dispense with all internal taxes, comprehending excises, stamps, auctions, licenses, carriages, and refined sugars, to which the postage on newspapers may be added to facilitate the progress of information, and that the remaining sources of revenue will be sufficient to provide for the support of Government, to pay the interest of the public debt, and to discharge the principals in shorter periods than the laws or the general expectation has contemplated. War, indeed, and untoward events may change this prospect of things and call for expenses which the imposts could not meet; but sound principles will not justify our taxing the industry of our fellow-citizens to accumulate treasure for wars to happen we know not when, and which might not perhaps happen but from the temptations offered by that treasure.

And again we find in the same document:

When we consider that this Government is charged with the external and mutual relations only of these States; that the States themselves have principal care of our persons, our property, and our reputation, constituting the great field of human concerns, we may well doubt whether our organization is not too complicated, too expensive; whether offices and officers have not been multiplied unnecessarily, and sometimes injuriously to the service they were intended to promote. I will cause to be laid before you an essay toward a statement of those who, under public employment of various kinds, draw money from the Treasury or from our citizens. Time has not permitted a perfect enumeration, the ramifications of office being too multiplied and remote to be completely traced in a first trial. Among those who are dependent on executive discretion I have begun the reduction of what was deemed necessary. * * * The inspectors of internal revenue who were found to obstruct the accountability of the institution have been discontinued.

And again, in his second annual message, we find the following, congratulating the country on what had been done:

When effects so salutary result from the plans you have already sanctioned, when merely by avoiding false objects of expense we are able, without a direct tax, without internal taxes, and without borrowing, to make large and effectual payments toward the discharge of our public debt and the emancipation of our posterity from that moral canker, it is an encouragement, fellow-citizens, of the highest order to proceed as we have begun, in substituting economy for taxation and in pursuing what is useful for a nation placed as we are, rather than what is practiced by others under different circumstances.

And lastly I will quote from his second inaugural address:

The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These, covering our land with officers and opening our doors to their intrusions, had already begun that process of domiciliary vexation which, once entered, is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of produce and property. If among these taxes some minor ones fell which had not been inconvenient, it was because their amount would not have paid the officers who collected them, and because, if they had any merit, the State authorities might adopt them instead of others less approved.

There are more people in this country than many seem to have any idea of that think this is mighty good reading now. The Democratic platform adopted at Chicago arraigned the Republican party for not relieving the people of "crushing war taxes," which I suppose my friends on this side of the House who differ with me as to the repeal of the internal revenue will say applies only to the tariff; but, sir, in the same instrument under which banner we fought and won in the last campaign it goes on to say:

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be.

And still further on it pronounces that—

The system of direct taxation known as the "internal revenue" is a war tax, and so long as the war continues, etc.

Going on to declare how it should be applied.

In another Democratic platform of the same year, that of my own State, there is no such uncertain sound. It says:

Resolved, That we are in favor of the unconditional and immediate abolition of the whole internal-revenue system, as an intolerable burden, a standing menace to freedom of elections, and a source of great annoyance and corruption in its practical operation.

Resolved, That no Government has the right to burden its people with taxes beyond the amount required to pay its necessary expenses and gradually extinguish its public debt; and that whenever the revenues, however derived, exceed this amount, they should be reduced so as to avoid a surplus in the Treasury. We therefore urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert themselves in favor of such legislation as will secure this end.

Resolved, That with respect to the tariff, we reaffirm the life-long and fundamental principles of the party as declared in the national Democratic platforms, and that the details of the method by which the constitutional revenue tariff shall be gradually reached, are subjects which the party's representatives at the Federal capital must be trusted to adjust; but in our opinion the duties on foreign importations should be levied for the production of public revenue, and the discrimination in its adjustment should be such as would place the highest rates on luxuries and the lowest on the necessities of life, distribute as equally as possible the burdens of taxation, and confer the greatest good to the greatest number of the American people.

And this, sir, is supplemented by the executive committee of the Democratic party of North Carolina in the following resolution, adopted October 19, 1887:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Democratic State executive committee that the internal-revenue laws should be immediately repealed; and our Democratic members of Congress are requested to use their influence, as they have heretofore done, to have said laws repealed, and to secure such modification of the tariff as will lessen the duties upon imports to such extent as will be possible, consistent with the economical administration of the Government.

And again, on February 23, 1888, they say:

Whereas the Democratic Legislatures of 1874, 1883, and 1885 passed resolutions asking for the repeal of the internal-revenue laws; and Whereas the Democratic State convention held in Raleigh in June, 1884, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we are in favor of the unconditional and immediate repeal of the whole internal-revenue system as an intolerable burden, a standing menace to freedom of elections, and a source of great annoyance and corruption in its practical operations." Now, therefore,

Resolved, That this Democratic State executive committee, in session at Raleigh, February 23, 1888, reaffirms the declarations of the Democratic party of North Carolina, and also reaffirms its own declaration made on the 19th of October, 1887, in favor of abolishing the whole internal-revenue system.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of Congress from North Carolina.

Sir, the platform and resolutions that have just been read voice the convictions and the hope of the Democratic party of my State, and with them I, sir, am and always have been in the fullest accord; and, sir, in their advocacy and support I claim the right of a free representative of a free people to act in accordance with my convictions, and I shall not go out of my party to do so; and I shall always, here and everywhere, stand by its cardinal principles, that so much concern the greatest blessing that a people can enjoy, that of personal liberty.

The aspiration to be free was planted in the breast of man as he came from the hand of the great Creator, and though often and for long periods crushed and oppressed until the darkness of usurpation and tyranny seemed to envelop the world and scarcely a glimmer of its pure ray could be seen, yet struggling ever upward through darkness toward the light, it still lives to enjoy the fullest realization of the hope that has sustained it always, in the Government founded and transmitted to us by our fathers.

The idea of Mr. Jefferson was to sustain the Federal Government by a tariff on imports and leave direct taxation for the States, and to be regulated by them. What a blessing this would be now. If he had lived at this period he would have seen a larger country suffering in greater proportion than its increased size from the same abuses he endeavored, with so much success, to reform in his own day and time, and there is no just reason to suppose that his mighty influence, united with the great majority of his own State, as well as of mine, would not be exerted now, as then, to rid the people of "internal-revenue taxes," "covering our land with officers," "and opening our doors to their intrusions," "which once entered is scarcely to be restrained from reaching every article of production and property."

These are his very words, and in quoting them to you I am reminded that only last session we were called upon to add to this system of taxation the "butter bill," which was done, and this session we are called upon to pass the "lard bill," which I am afraid will be done, and when we set a bad thing or principle in motion, with a downward grade and as greasy a track as these two articles make, who can say

where it will stop? The principle of these taxes is all wrong, and if I know what constitutes Democracy, it is undemocratic. The Democratic party of North Carolina is as honest and true as any political organization that ever existed in this country, and upon its success and control of our State government I verily believe depend the honor, the peace, and prosperity of our good old State. I have never deserted her in any struggle, and I can not and will not do so now, and mark my prediction, as the Democracy of North Carolina stood then, so it stands now and will stand in the coming campaign. She will not change because the flesh-pots of the revenue department have been transferred from Republican to Democratic officials.

We can not afford to barter the priceless inheritance of our manhood as a people and a party of principle for such a mess of pottage. To these declarations of my party of my own State I am now, and always have been, in full accord, and I give notice to you, gentlemen, on both sides of this Chamber, that when this bill comes up under consideration for amendment I shall claim the right of a Representative on this floor to offer an amendment to repeal the entire tax and system, and if that should fail of passing, then to repeal the brandy tax, and any other modifications that I may be able to get in, and shall endeavor to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the same in the House, so that we may see, and the country may see, where the Representatives of the American people stand on this subject; and if any gentleman upon either side of this House is more successful than myself in point of time and opportunity in getting in such amendments, I pledge him here and now, I care not from what section he may come, or what may be his political creed and faith, my earnest and unqualified support to the measure.

Sir, go with me for a while and see the workings of this "infernal machine" in the country where I live. It is a land, sir, beautiful to look upon, abounding in fruit and grain, with mountains, valleys, and streams as picturesque as the pen of Scott e'er portrayed, and a climate abounding in exhilarating and health-giving influences, with waters that flow clear and cool from its life-giving fountains; yet, sir, in large districts of our country are communities without any railroad facilities, and the summer fruit grown upon trees planted and bearing long before this iniquitous law was made must fall and rot upon the ground, millions of bushels of it, because there is no way to market or save it profitably. This, sir, is by far the most cruel part of this law—the part that taxes fruit brandy. It is not claimed that there is any necessity for the revenue; there is, upon the other hand, a necessity for not obtaining it. Then why can not the farmer have the right to still his fruit free in a free country? "Oh," they say, "it would leave open gaps for avoiding the law taxing whisky." Can law be so framed as not to leave gaps for its avoidance? Is there no confidence to be placed in the honor of the people that they will obey the laws for their own self-respect and for the sake of obedience?

Then no such laws should have existence in a free country where the people rule. Give them this free license, sir, if you can do no more, and the remainder of the internal-revenue law will be executed all the more thoroughly, because this very liberty will bring public opinion more in accord with it; and without the support of public opinion no law can be executed with good effect. I would not give much for the nose of a revenue officer who could not tell the difference between brandy and whisky, and especially when the two are mixed to any considerable degree, and that, too, without any chemical process; for it is said by those who know that the mixing greatly deteriorates both in quality, flavor, and effect. But especially would detection be easy when we hear arguments here based upon the results accomplished by chemical science telling the kind, quality, and how much of each ingredient there is that enters into the manufacture of oleomargarine. There is no such trouble about the repeal of the brandy tax. It is only a story concocted by the big whisky interests to prevent its being given this advantage over grain distillations.

Now, sir, as to the whisky tax. It is not because we want more whisky, or cheaper whisky in the country, or more distilleries, that we demand a repeal of the law. There are in my State now at least five times as many whisky distilleries as there was before the law, and each one of those distilleries makes five or ten times as much liquor as they did before the enactment of the law; for before the enactment of this law there were but few distilleries in the whole State that operated except in the fall and early winter months. The custom through all our country, at this time when there was no surveillance and no tax on spirits, was to run the distilleries only from crop-gathering time until the early winter, when the hogs were fattened on the slop. Then the hogs were killed, the whisky was marketed, and the distillery closed until another year.

How is it now in the same country? They are usually run year in and year out, and when all the grain that our fertile lowlands yield has been bought and distilled it is brought from Cincinnati and the markets of the West to the nearest depot, and often hauled 40 and 50 miles and more into the country and distilled. We should always have plenty of grain in my country for man and beast, and yet, sir, I have seen the time there, and that, too, after years of plentiful crops, when poor laboring men, and women, too, who are unable to provide a year's supply in advance, might be seen going from house to house begging the privilege of buying corn enough to bread them until har-

vest, and having hard work to find it, and that because the remorseless worm of the still had devoured it before them.

Talk about the moral influence of this law! Tell it to those who know nothing about it, but tell it not to me. It sows a bountiful crop of oaths and makes smooth the way to a bountiful harvest of perjuries. The whole system is rotten to the core and is only held together by the cohesive attraction of public plunder. It is a menace and a threat to free institutions and is obnoxious to all liberty-loving people. Of course none of those who engage in the business of distilling get very rich by it; few of them make any considerable profit clear of expenses and contingencies, and many of them come to ruin; but, lured by the *ignis fatuus* of the increase of price which the tax makes, they press ahead, hoping to find the "potful of money at the end of the rainbow." If any of them should be for a time, through diligence, industry, sobriety, and strict attention to business, all of which are mighty hard on human nature in the circumstances in which he is placed—but if for a time he should be successful and come to the accumulation of some property, buy some new teams and wagons and some "Sunday clothes," there is another branch of this law watching with greedy eyes to pounce upon him as a hawk would upon a fat pigeon, for some violation of the law more technical than criminal, and straightway proceed to pick him clean, and when, after forfeiting his team and wagons to this rich and overflowing Treasury and serving his term in some filthy county jail, or in the penitentiary, he is released from the clutches of the law to make his way homeward, his patriotism, like Bob Acres's courage, all gone, and his only relief to "cuss" the court and the law that will not allow a man to do as he pleases with his own.

This is the way it happens to the Government distiller that in some way gets crooked; but if a "blockader" gets caught, they make short work of him, and, as he stands under the sentence of the law, I imagine I can hear him soliloquize in the language of old "Groundhog Cayce," in a book by Miss Murfree, entitled *The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains*. The old man, speaking of the trials and difficulties which he has in his business, and which he can not understand, appealing to common reason, says:

Lord A'mighty, air the corn mine, or no? Air the orchard mine or the raiders'? An' what ails me ez I can't make whisky an apple-jack same ez in my dad's time, when him an' me run a sour-mash still on the top o' the mounting in the light o' day, up'ards o' twenty year, an' never hearn o' no raider? Tell me that's agin the law nowadays? Waal, now, who made that law? I never, an' I ain't agoin' ter abide by it, nuther. Ez sure ez ye air born, if air jes' a Yankee trick fotched down hyar by the Federal Army. An' ef I had knowed they war goin' ter gin tharse's ter sech persecutions arter the war, I dunno how I'd hev got my consent ter fit alongside o' 'em like I done fower year far the Union.

There is much in the language attributed to this illiterate old man that voices the same ideas that permeated the minds of our American ancestors when they fought and won the battles of the Revolution; the same that actuated our English ancestors when they wrenched from the mailed hand of King John the Magna Charta of British liberty.

This bill, sir, I consider the first serious proposition coming from the Ways and Means Committee of this House to afford relief from any part of this tax and from the inquisitorial rigors of this law, and as such it shall have my support. Removing the tobacco tax will be a good thing for the farmer, enabling him to sell his crop without subjecting himself to infringement of the law, and the abolition of retail licenses, for which I have labored most assiduously, will go a great way toward ridding the country of frivolous prosecutions in the Federal courts, for experience and observation show that in most of the cases originating there, after passing all the more serious charges in the information or bill, the prosecution dwindles down to a little retailing case that would scarcely comport with the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace or of a police court. Yes, pass these amendments to the law, and give to the Federal court judges the discretion of fixing the punishment for these offenses against the internal-revenue law without being confined by a minimum limit, and good people everywhere that know anything about the workings of this law will thank you and hope for more and better things.

In justice, sir, to the present administration of the law I am constrained to say that it is conducted on much more humane principles than heretofore. But a few years ago, and when the States were passing laws prohibiting the carrying of deadly weapons by the citizens, armed bands of revenue officers could be seen riding through the country with carbines swung around their shoulders and pistols hanging from their belts, in quiet hamlets and neighborhoods, frightening women and children, and arousing a spirit of antagonism among the men. But now, sir, in my own section at least, the arms have all been collected and sent back here to Washington, and yet the law is better enforced and more money collected than heretofore. But, sir, I shall always maintain that the whole thing ought to go, executed as it is by aid of spies and informers and inquisitions carried into the domiciles and cellars of the people, with no sanctuary so sacred as to keep out the invasion of the revenue officer. It is impossible to make it popular with the people that witness its administration without destroying their manhood and love of the principle of personal liberty, which, I pray God, may never be done.

Statistics show that under its influence the use of alcoholic liquors

is on the increase. In 1840 the amount used per head was 4 gallons for that year, and in 1883 it was 12 gallons per head. During the five years preceding 1884 the population increased about 15 per cent., but the consumption of distilled spirits increased 44.15 per cent. It has not lessened the appetite for it, nor is its respectability impaired by making it a "licensed," taxed "luxury," with the stamp and seal of the Government upon it, so that a man feels that when he takes a drink he is helping to support the Government, and to be really patriotic he must take all he can, and especially is this so on a rainy evening about a Federal court green when a poor fellow is waiting to be called in for trial. It takes a good deal under such circumstances to keep his patriotism above zero.

The people feel, sir, that these matters should be left to the regulation of their States respectively. They love their State governments, and more blood and treasure, including the days of the Revolution, have been spent to maintain the right of local self-government than for any other cause on this continent.

It is a question, sir, that involves the liberty of Maine as well as South Carolina; as much that of Indiana as that of Texas. Upon it, the very union of these independent States depend. Strike it down, take from the people this inestimable right and State lines become obliterated, Territories are merged into each other, and centralization and despotism inevitable follow. Make this law a perpetuity, as some argue should be done; keep the strong hand of the Government continually clutching and interfering with State courts and laws and the rights and occupations of citizens; fill the land with Federal officers and keep them there with the execution of their offices above the laws of the State, and you fill the hearts of good men with despair, though they never made a drop of whisky in their lives, though they may not even drink it, and though they may be opposed to its use.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the whisky-making or the whisky-drinking element of society that I represent in this argument, but I feel that I voice the sentiment of the law-abiding, God-fearing, Christian people of my country when I say, Down with the demoralizing system of internal revenue! The moral element of the land have got the true idea of this institution at last, which for so long a time—God save the mark—has run as an adjunct to morality and temperance, and their opposition will grow more and more intense as they learn more about it.

Sir, in my political prayers I pray first for the success of the Democratic party in my own State, and then in the Union. You have been told to look at the history of that period before 1876, to see from what we escaped in that memorable campaign. In the light of this history, and the certainty of its being repeated by Republican success, if the issue which is to come before the people in the next election could be submitted to me with this alternative, "You can not have both; which will you take, success in the State election or success in the Federal election?" much as I admire Grover Cleveland, our honored and beloved President, and much as I appreciate the honest, clean administration he has given us, and the confidence which the whole people of our country so justly have in his patriotism and integrity, and much as I hope for his renomination and election, I would emphatically answer, "You may take the Federal administration with all its offices, with all its money wrongfully torn from the people to waste and squander, with all its 'boodle,' but give me Democratic home rule in North Carolina."

There, sir, we have a constitution formulated by a Democratic convention, adopted by a Democratic majority of the voters of the State, laws enacted under it by Democratic legislatures, and kept in force by a Democratic administration; the colored man has the right to vote and does so as freely and without control as the white man; he has the right to hold office and all the rights of citizenship, with an equal distribution per capita of the public-school money; he is contented and happy and there is no friction or clash between the races as such, unless it is aroused by bad men at home and abroad with a desire to stir up strife between the races and thereby control the colored vote for their own selfish ends and not for the good of the colored man.

Left to themselves, sir, the colored people know that the best friends they have are the white people, with whom they have been reared and who know them best. It is a moral and political sin to disturb by such means the peace and quiet of that country that is now engaged in earnest effort in working out the solution of one of the greatest political problems in the world, and with an earnest desire to do justice to all. But, sir, if evil counsels must prevail, and the issue is to be presented to us as to which race we will have to control the destinies of this country or of our own State government, I say here and now, standing in my place as the representative of a brave and honorable people, that we expect to be able to maintain for North Carolina, and that, too, without a resort to violence, a white man's government, for white men and white women, and for white children.

Look, sir, at what the Democratic party has done for North Carolina. It has paid her debts, restored her credit lost under carpet-bag rule, brought confidence to our people and to those abroad having capital to invest, encouraged and built public improvements and promoted private enterprise, vastly increased our facilities for education, and has brought about, by giving us an honest and economical management of public affairs, a degree of individual and public prosperity never be-

fore known in the history of our State, and yet we have much to do and much that we can do. We are not begging for help or for greater "protection" than the rest of our fellow-citizens are entitled to.

We only ask the privilege under salutary laws of being allowed to work out our own salvation. Capital can find no safer place for investment. The next ten years will show greater improvement in North Carolina than the past twenty years have done, and in twenty years from to-day we will have reached a degree of prosperity not dreamed of now even by those who by their enterprise and labor are contributing so much to it. With a name as stainless as any star in the bright constellation of the Union that floats above our heads to-day, her sons and her daughters now, and generations yet to come, will rise up and call her blessed. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Several messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 83) accepting the invitation of the French Republic to take part in the international exposition to be held in Paris in 1889;

An act (H. R. 48) for the relief of Benjamin M. Simpson;

An act (H. R. 3215) to authorize the construction of the Ohio Connecting Railway Company bridge; and

An act (H. R. 9430) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to award a gold medal of the first class to Capt. Thomas Sampson, of New York City, for rescuing five boys from drowning.

The message also announced that the bill (H. R. 1712) for the erection of a public building at Portsmouth, Ohio, having been presented to the President April 30, 1888, and not having been returned by him to the House in which it originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without his approval.

EDWARD FITZGERALD.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on War Claims the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill just reported by the gentleman from Kentucky is one which I endeavored to call up some time ago; but one or two gentlemen on the other side objected then to its consideration. They have since investigated the matter and do not now wish to object. The bill merely provides for the reference of a claim to the War Department, to be audited and reported back to Congress. It makes no appropriation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Quartermaster-General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to examine the claim of the Right Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, Bishop of Little Rock, trustee of the Catholic Church in Arkansas, for timber and fuel belonging to said church, alleged to have been taken by the United States, or the armies thereof, at or near Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, during the war of the rebellion; and he may consider the evidence heretofore taken on said claim, so far as applicable, before the Commissioners of Claims and such other legal evidence as may be adduced before him in behalf of said trustee or in behalf of the United States, and shall report the facts to Congress, to be considered with other claims reported by the Quartermaster-General.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to

GRANT OF LAND TO WYOMING FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES.

Mr. CAREY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes. This bill has been favorably reported to-day by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], from the Committee on Public Lands, and a House bill of similar purport was favorably reported some time ago.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the governor of the Territory of Wyoming is hereby authorized and empowered to cause to be selected and entered of the public lands contained within the boundaries of the Fort Sanders military reservation, in said Territory, as soon after the extension of the public surveys through said reservation as practicable, to an amount not exceeding 640 acres, as nearly as practicable in square form according to the public surveys; that the lands so selected and entered are hereby granted to the Territory of Wyoming for the purpose of enabling the said Territory to maintain thereon a fish-hatchery and other public institutions: *Provided,* That if the said Territory shall at any time permit the said lands hereby granted to be used for any purpose not contem-

plated by this act the said lands shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed or have the effect to impair the rights of any person in or to any portion of said lands acquired under any law of the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has this bill received the consideration of the Committee on the Public Lands?

Mr. CAREY. Yes, sir; and has been unanimously reported with a favorable recommendation.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolution of the House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer, for the purpose of correcting the same; and the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to insert in said bill the word "unexpected" instead of the word "unexpended."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley from July 4 to October 27, 1888; also that the Senate requested a conference with the House on said bill and amendments, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL.

RUDOLF LOBSIGER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SPRINGER, referred, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on War Claims:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State relative to the claim of Mr. Rudolf Lobsiger, a Swiss citizen, against the United States, and recommend that provision be made by law for referring the matter to the Court of Claims for examination on its merits.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 14, 1888.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, accompanied by a report of Mr. Somerville P. Tuck, appointed to carry out certain provisions of section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the ascertainment of claims of American citizens for spoiliations committed by the French prior to the 31st day of July, 1801," approved January 20, 1885.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 14, 1888.

Mr. SPRINGER. That message, I presume, Mr. Speaker, should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, as it relates to pending litigation in the Court of Claims. I move that reference.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I make the suggestion that it is probable it should go to the Committee on Appropriations, as my recollection is that at the beginning of this session certain reports of the Court of Claims were referred to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report back in reference to them.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to refer the message to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to; and the message was accordingly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to offer a bill for my kinsman, Mr. CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE; and also ask unanimous consent that other gentlemen having bills to offer may present them now for proper reference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS, FLORIDA AND OTHER STATES.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas (by Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Ken-

tucky), introduced a bill (H. R. 9982) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act for the final adjustment of private land claims in the States of Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1860; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

BUSINESS FROM COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Tuesday, May 22, immediately after the reading of the Journal, be set apart for the consideration of bills and resolutions reported from the Committee on Labor.

PER DIEM RATED SERVICE-PENSION BILL.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I present to Congress, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, two very brief petitions, but signed by a very large number of persons. One of these petitions is signed by almost 1,000 soldiers of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania; the other petition is signed by 2,300 soldiers and citizens of Beaver County, Pennsylvania. These petitions were prepared with great care and labor. I can assure Congress that they are genuine signatures of actual citizens. They are both on the same subject, and are in favor of the per diem rated service-pension bill. I ask this because I believe this subject is one of great importance; that these petitions represent the general sentiment of the people of my district on this subject.

I offer them and call the special attention of Congress to the great demand there is by ex-soldiers and the citizens of our country for additional legislation on the subject of pensions. I am hoping that some heed will be given to these petitions, and that a day for the consideration of these and other general pension bills will be given by this Congress at an early date. I ask unanimous consent that one of these petitions, the two being identical in substance, may be printed in the RECORD without the signatures.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The petition is as follows:

To the honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned surviving soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy, heartily indorse the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service during the war of the rebellion. And we urge upon Congress its immediate passage.

ESTATE OF THOMAS L. PRICE, DECEASED.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of Senate bill No. 475, for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to credit to Thomas L. Price, of Jefferson City, Mo., late brigadier-general of United States volunteers, and now deceased, the sum of \$2,000, being the amount received at Jefferson City, October 7, 1861, of R. O. Wariner, a paymaster in the United States Army, by order of General John C. Frémont, for special public purposes at that post by said Price, then commanding said post, and to release the estate of said Price from any and all liability therefor.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. BLAND moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask that the committee of conference asked for by the Senate on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government, the Bureau of Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and the Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, on June 4 to October 27, 1888, just reported from the Senate, be agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection the House will non-concur in the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The committee of conference will be appointed hereafter.

ESTATE OF FRANCIS M. MURRAY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of the estate of Francis M. Murray, deceased, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representatives of Francis M. Murray, deceased, late of McCracken County, Kentucky, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,500, for 3,000 bushels of stone-coal taken by and delivered to the steam-boats White Cloud and Silver Moon, in the year 1863, at Paducah, in the State of Kentucky, said boats being at the time in the employment of the Navy Department of the United States.

The Committee on War Claims recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

Strike out "\$1,500," in line 7, and insert "\$900."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment concurred in, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

A. R. HARTZELL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill H. R. 3604.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3604) granting an honorable discharge to A. R. Hartzell, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the order heretofore made, dishonorably dismissing from the military service of the United States A. R. Hartzell, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Cavalry, be, and the same is hereby, revoked, annulled, and set aside, and that the Secretary of War is ordered to grant to said Hartzell an honorable discharge, and to correct the records of his Department showing the removal of the said order of dismissal; and the said A. R. Hartzell is restored to all rights and privileges lost or suspended by such order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let the report in that case be read.

The report (by Mr. GEAR) was read in part.

Mr. PERKINS (interrupting the reading). The report is rather long; and perhaps it would be as satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois if I were to give a brief explanation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Very well.

Mr. PERKINS. It was charged that this man had been guilty of quitting his guard-post without the permission of his superior officer. His own captain, however, admits that the charge was not sustained in the trial by court-martial. But he was convicted of disobedience of orders, and according to the captain's testimony the sentence was a very arbitrary and severe one. It is to be remembered he was a private and not a commissioned officer.

Ten years after the war closed for some reason he was dishonorably discharged. That was in 1874. He was dishonorably dismissed as a soldier upon an order issued from the War Department. The effect of this bill is to annul that order. That is all there is of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. What was the order he disobeyed?

Mr. PERKINS. He refused to go on escort in December, 1862, being without an overcoat, unless he should be furnished one. The weather, according to the testimony of the captain and other officers, was exceedingly severe and cold. He was part of a command which had been ordered to escort some Arkansas militia to their homes to spend New Year's with their families.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was rather a severe sentence.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Does the committee recommend the passage of the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir. I may say in addition that after this soldier had been confined fifteen days he escaped, and soon after his escape returned.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PERKINS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs have had under consideration the bill and papers, with accompanying evidence, in the case of Adam R. Hartzell, for whom relief is asked by House bill 3604, and find that Adam R. Hartzell enlisted as a private in Company H, First Iowa Cavalry Volunteers, at Keokuk, Iowa, in August, 1861, to serve for three years, unless sooner discharged. He served with credit and distinction and as a brave and patriotic soldier until late in December, 1863, when he was placed under arrest by the captain of his company, and subsequently court-martialed. At this court-martial he was charged with quitting his guard without the leave of his superior officer, and "disobedience of orders." He was found guilty and sentenced to forfeit all pay and allowances now due or that shall become due him, except \$2 per month of his monthly pay, and to be confined at hard labor with ball and chain until the expiration of his term of enlistment, in such military prison as the commanding general may designate.

In February, 1864, the military prison at Little Rock, Ark., was designated as the place of his confinement, and he was committed February 11, 1864. He remained in confinement until February 25, 1864, when he escaped therefrom. Soon after his escape he returned to his company, but not on duty. He messed much of the time with his company, and made no effort to conceal himself. His company was at the time at Little Rock, and his presence was known to his officers and comrades, and no effort was made to recapture him or to return

him to prison. He belonged to the non-veterans of his company, and continued with them much of the time after his escape until they went home in the fall of 1864 to be mustered out. Hartzell accompanied the others home, but was not mustered out in consequence of having no descriptive roll.

This was the condition of things for several years, when Hartzell employed an attorney to secure for him an honorable discharge. But instead of granting an honorable discharge, the commanding general, Department of the Platt, in June, 1874, upon instructions from the War Department, furnished him a dishonorable discharge, to date February 25, 1864, and it is to relieve him of the odium of such dishonorable discharge that the present bill is presented. Much evidence has been filed in the War Department, and also presented to your committee, in support of the petition for an honorable discharge for this soldier. This evidence has been carefully considered by your committee, and from it the following conclusions are reached:

1. That the soldier was not guilty of quitting his guard without leave, as charged at the time of his court-martial.

2. That he was guilty of "disobedience of orders," but with these mitigating circumstances:

On the 31st day of December, 1863, at Little Rock, Ark., Captain Wisemand, with a part of his command, was ordered out to escort some Arkansas militia to their homes, some 40 miles distant, to spend New Year's with their families. Mr. Hartzell, belonging to this company, was detailed by the captain to be one of the escort. The weather was exceedingly cold for that locality, and the ride was long; and Hartzell, being without an overcoat, refused to go unless he could be furnished one. In fact the entire company was without overcoats, in consequence of their loss by fire, and Captain Wisemand, who detailed the soldier as a part of the escort, and who preferred the charges against him upon which he was court-martialed, says in his evidence filed with the committee that Hartzell refused—

"To go out upon the scout when ordered, and sought to justify his refusal on the grounds that he was willing to go if furnished with an overcoat, being without one himself and unable to get one. This was true, and it was also true that the weather was extremely cold and severe at the time, and a soldier ran a great risk of being frost-bitten, even with his overcoat."

This, in the judgment of your committee, from a careful examination of the testimony, was the sum of his offending; and while your committee is not inclined to look with leniency upon the offense of a soldier disobeying the orders of his superior officers, yet in the case of this soldier we are shocked with the severity of the punishment, and find nothing in the record or testimony to justify it. In fact Captain Wisemand, who preferred the charges, says in his testimony—

"That while the offense of refusing to go on a scout when regularly detailed was, in a military sense, a serious one and called for punishment, yet I had no idea that any such severe punishment would be inflicted as that announced by the court-martial."

"That if a sentence of two weeks' imprisonment had been imposed without any forfeiture of pay, I should have regarded it as entirely sufficient for the offense, and have always been of the opinion that the punishment fixed by the court-martial was unjustly severe under all the circumstances of the case."

It seems to your committee that this must be the feeling of all who review the circumstances of this case, and perhaps this explains why no effort was made to return the soldier to the military prison after his escape therefrom after a confinement therein of two weeks.

Why the soldier should have been dishonorably discharged from the service almost ten years after the term of his enlistment expired is unknown in reason or law to your committee. It was not a part of the judgment of the court-martial, and he was certainly not a deserter, and he had no notice of any charge against him that would justify such an order. In fact, the only charge that could have been made was that he had escaped from a military prison and did not voluntarily return to wear a ball and chain during the remaining time of his enlistment.

He belonged to an honorable family and for years has been living in the State of Kansas and is a respected citizen, and, in the judgment of your committee should be given an honorable discharge as a soldier.

In fact, your committee is of the opinion that he should be permitted to recover the money due him at the time of his arrest. And we recommend that the bill do pass.

ROAD TO NEW BERNE (N. C.) NATIONAL CEMETERY.

Mr. SIMMONS. I call up for consideration at this time, from the Union Calendar, the bill H. R. 4320.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the construction of a graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city.

Whereas there is now no public road leading to the national cemetery near the city of New Berne, N. C., but access to said cemetery can be had only over a private road belonging to and kept open at the discretion of the adjacent land-owners; and

Whereas the said land proprietors are willing to donate to the United States the right of way over their said lands from the said city of New Berne to the said national cemetery; Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct a good and durable graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, in the State of North Carolina, to the national cemetery near said city, over such road and along such route as he may deem proper. And for the purpose of carrying into effect the foregoing provisions of this act the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, said money to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, or so much thereof as may be necessary for said purpose.

SEC. 2. That before any money shall be expended as aforesaid the title to the right of way shall be granted to the United States free of cost.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with the following amendment:

In the first section, line 9, strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$20,000."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. How long is the road?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is about 2 miles in length.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SIMMONS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was

passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

C. B. WILSON.

Mr. SYMES. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to give credit to C. B. Wilson, present postmaster at Buena Vista, Colo., for the sum of \$225, money-order funds remitted by said Wilson, as said postmaster, to the post-office at Denver, Colo., in accordance with the postal rules and regulations, and mislaid or lost in the post-office at Denver, Colo.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let the report be read.

Mr. SYMES. I think I can make a brief explanation which may obviate the reading of the report.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Very well.

Mr. SYMES. The claimant in this case in December, 1886, transmitted from Buena Vista to the postmaster at Denver, Colo., \$225 of money-order funds. It is proved conclusively to the Department that the money was received in the Denver office, but was there lost or mislaid. The Postmaster-General specially recommends that the claimant be granted the relief asked for.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I withdraw the request for the reading of the report.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SYMES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

HEIRS OF CHRISTOPHER COTT.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs of Christopher Cott, late a private in Company B, McLaughlin's Independent Squadron, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, the pay, bounty, and all other allowances of a private of cavalry from the 30th day of April, 1864, to the 30th day of November, 1864, the supposed date of the said soldier's death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JESSE COE.

Mr. HUNTER. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 6233) for the relief of Jesse Coe.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived, the House, pursuant to order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. LAWLER: A bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLISS: A bill (H. R. 9963) to increase the pension of Mrs. Fannie A. Boyd, widow of Capt. O. B. Boyd—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9964) for the relief of Walter A. Newberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9965) for the relief of John Cordova—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9966) for the relief of Alfred Rauland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9967) for the relief of Christian Kunzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLTON: A bill (H. R. 9968) for the relief of John S. Williford—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9969) for the benefit of Garland Ford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9970) granting a pension to Jacob A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 9971) for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 9972) to correct the military record of Milton Fuson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9973) pensioning Henry Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) for the relief of George Prescott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAISH: A bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Joseph Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 9976) to remove the charge of desertion from T. J. Nicholson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9977) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to extend a side track into square No. 1025 in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 9978) for the relief of A. C. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) for the relief of Martha A. Bibb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9980) for the relief of the administrator of H. L. Carpenter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9981) for the relief of James M. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 9983) granting increase of pension to Moses W. Adley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of Samuel A. Lockhart, of Jefferson County, Arkansas, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Petition of P. K. Bauman, for the estate of Frederick Bauman, of Spottsylvania County, Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHEADLE: Petition of Col. J. R. Copeland and 164 others, citizens and ex-soldiers of Harrison County, Indiana, for the re-enactment of the arrears-of-pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of Christian Kunzie, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Detroit Board of Trade, in favor of a winter bridge across the Detroit River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COWLES: Petition of citizens of Montana, for restriction on mineral-land grants to railroads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIBBLE: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce, of Charleston, S. C., in favor of incorporating the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of the same, in favor of 1 cent postage per ounce on letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the same, in opposition to the bill to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ERMENROUT: Memorial of the Mat Makers' Protective Association, for the passage of the O'Neill bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Smith & Dove Manufacturing Company, of Andover, Mass., for preservation of the present tariff on flax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State Board of Transportation of Nebraska, for the passage of House bill 8367—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of Jane Newhouse, widow of F. M. Newhouse, of Gibson County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GUENTHER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., against amending the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HEARD: Petition of Jonah White, for a pension as a Mexican war veteran—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of E. P. Ripley, of Ackley, Iowa, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HIRES: Petition of citizens of Bridgeton, N. J., for a reduction of postage on plants, bulbs, seeds, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of D. C. Francis and 30 others, citizens of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, against reduction of tariff on window glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of L. W. Walker, sr., of Sumner County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of A. D. Harris, heir of Thomas Harris, of Panola County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of Moses W. Adley, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Peoria, Ill., against the action proposed by the so-called Wilson bill, and against any legislation having for its object the lessening of competition in interstate traffic—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of 14 ex-soldiers of Bryant, Fulton County, Illinois, in favor of the passage of the disability bill without amendment—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of A. J. Drumwright, and of heirs of Hiram Jenkins, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Memorial of the Knights of Labor of Genoa, Ohio, opposing the granting of pensions to civil officers of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of John R. Bower and hundreds of citizens of Utica, N. Y., against the passage of the Mills bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY SMITH: Petition of John Wellstein and 15 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of House bill 8716, relating to convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of William Preacher and H. W. Platts and E. S. Roberts, heirs of Elizabeth Platts, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Alford Loftin, of Joseph Williamson, of George T. Hughes, administrator of M. L. Stockard, and administrator of Jane W. Hamer, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GRIMES: Of Bradfield & Slack, E. D. Pitman, and others, citizens of Troup County, Georgia.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS: Of druggists of Bedford and Montgomery Counties, Virginia.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. BACON (by request): Of 118 citizens of Rockland County, New York.

By Mr. SNYDER: Of D. L. Ruffner and others, citizens of West Virginia.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Of citizens of Phelps, N. Y.

By Mr. GROUT: Of G. A. Webster and 34 others, of East Randolph, Vermont.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. FORD: Of members of B. F. Chapin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cheshire, Allegan County, Michigan.

By Mr. HEARD: Of citizens of Dallas County, Missouri.

By Mr. POST: Of 52 ex-Union soldiers of Peoria County, Illinois.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. A. J. HOPKINS: Of 98 citizens of Kane County, Ill.

By Mr. KERR: Of 141 citizens of Marshall, Cedar, and Benton Counties, Iowa.

By Mr. PAYSON: Of 98 citizens of Woodford County, Illinois.

By Mr. REED: Of 76 citizens of York County, Maine.

By Mr. SNYDER: Of 29 citizens of Fayette County, West Virginia.

By Mr. J. W. STEWART: Of 204 citizens of Rutland and Franklin Counties, Vermont.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of 155 citizens of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters were severally referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: Of Y. J. Clark and others, citizens of Russell Creek post-office, Patrick County, Virginia.

By Mr. CANDLER: Of N. F. Bearden and others, citizens of Georgia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 15, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the condition of the freedmen in the Chickasaw Nation in the Indian Territory; which, with the accom-

panying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the land claimed by the Tillamook Indians in Oregon, with copies of two ratified treaties; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GEORGE presented the memorial of J. H. McCarty and other citizens of Choctaw County; the memorial of W. G. Morgan and other Patrons of Husbandry of Perry County; the memorial of M. Bankston and 25 other citizens of Franklin County; the memorial of A. M. Mansen and 22 other citizens of Newton County; the memorial of W. J. Crisler and 20 other citizens of Hinds County; the memorial of F. A. Howell and 17 other citizens of Holmes County; the memorial of Benjamin Drane and 99 other citizens of Choctaw County, and the memorial of G. G. Morgan and 17 other citizens of Perry County, all in the State of Mississippi, remonstrating against any change in the Bureau of Animal Industry; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PASCO. I present the petition of Joel B. Myers and 13 other citizens of Hillsborough County, Florida, with reference to legislation relating to the Fort Brooke military reservation near Tampa, Fla., and praying that certain rights claimed therein by them may be duly considered. I also present a similar petition of Dorcas Bryant and 16 other citizens of Hillsborough County, Florida. I understand that this matter is before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I move the reference of the petitions to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, presented the petition of Robert Weare, of Little Rock, Ark., praying Congress to grant him a reissue of two honorable discharges from the Army and Navy, which he had received, but which were stolen from him; and also that he be paid all arrears of bounty, pensions, or other moneys to which he may be entitled; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the petition of George A. Priest and 94 other ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Michigan, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of citizens of Meadow Creek, Mont., praying for the passage of laws securing the preservation of the mineral lands of Montana to citizens of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of John C. Cahoon, C. C. Cahoon, E. W. Dean, and 11 others, members of the Taunton Gun Club, and other citizens of Taunton, Mass., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. EDMUNDS presented the petition of Thomas H. Chubb and 13 other citizens of Post Mill Village, Vt., praying for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of the Port Townsend (Wash.) Board of Trade, praying that a larger appropriation be made for the support of the revenue-marine service; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of 117 citizens of Orangeton and Clarksville, Rockland County, New York, praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, providing for the better protection of Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of citizens of Montana Territory, praying that the mineral lands in that Territory may be reserved by law to citizens of the United States, and that the Northern Pacific Railroad Company may be prevented from acquiring any lands to which it is not clearly entitled; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report a resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, by subcommittee or otherwise, are authorized to collect information, to take testimony, to employ a stenographer, to administer oaths, as they may deem most expedient; and the expenses therefor shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, under the rule.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask leave for the Committee on Finance to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks that the Committee on Finance have leave to sit during the sessions of the Senate. It is so ordered, if there be no objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 849) granting a pension to Morgan Gordon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.