his gallant and heroic conduct, and in other campaigns has frequently been the recipient of honorable and praiseworthy mention for his valor and services in the field, and he has been several times recommended for brevet promotion; but under existing laws, being unable to confer this recognition for valor, the officers ceased to ask for it, or there would be a larger number of instances which I could refer to.

"To omit many instances, I will observe that he distinguished himself by leading a charge, on the 17th of March, 1876, on Powder River, and in several charges on the Rosebud, on the 17th of June, 1876, in an engagement with the same Indians who massacred General Custer's command, and eight days before that fight. In this engagement, at the Rosebud, Captain Bourke saved my life after I was shot in the right elbow and left wrist joints, causing total disability. He rode into the very midst of the Indians and rescued me, although the nearest skirmish line was at least a thousand yards away. I could give other instances, but it would make this letter too long.

"Major Henry, of the Tenth Cavalry, distinguished himself in this engagement, and so did Major Mills, of the Ninth Cavalry; and Major Mills whipped the Indians and won the first victory after the Custer massacre, and it was one of the most brilliant ones of the campaign. Colonel Hatch, of the Ninth Cavalry, distinguished at a more recent date, and many others. But it will occur that from the frequent and constant Indian warfare that the instances of valor are numerous, and your bill will enable the President and Senate to recognize it by a nominal promotion.

"I have the honor to remain, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"E. A. SNOW.

"Hon. CHARLES F. MANDERSON,
"*United States Senator for Nebraska.*"

After full consideration of the subject-matter your committee have struck out the preamble of the bill (S. 1323) and have amended the title and the bill so as to allow brevet rank to be conferred on "all officers of the Army now on the active or retired lists, who, by their department commander and with the concurrence of the commanding general of the Army, have been or may be recommended for gallant service in action against hostile Indians since January 1, 1867," the brevet commissions to bear date only from the passage of this act; the date of the heroic action for which the brevet rank is conferred to appear in the commission, such rank to be only honorary, without privilege of precedence or command not already provided for by the statutes which embody the rules and articles governing the Army.

As amended the measure has the approval of Lieutenant-General Sheridan, under date of March 29, 1888.

Your committee accordingly report the bill (S. 1323) back favorably, amended as heretofore stated, and recommend its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on officers of the United States Army for gallant services in Indian campaigns."

The preamble was stricken out.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. REAGAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, and Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interfere with the desire of any Senator to proceed with legislative business; but it is necessary to have a brief executive session, and unless there be some objection I will now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before submitting that question the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 17, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1888.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. Charles E. L. B. Davis, to be major, April 7, 1888, *vice* Smith, promoted.

First Lieut. George McC. Derby, to be captain, April 7, 1888, *vice* Davis, promoted.

Second Lieut. William L. Sibert, to be first lieutenant, April 7, 1888, *vice* Derby, promoted.

FOR APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Eugene W. Van C. Lucas, First Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, May 14, 1888, *vice* Sibert, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1888.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Robert L. Tidrick, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be register of the land office at Des Moines, Iowa.

William H. Steele, of Montrose, Colo., to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry Charles Fink, of Lake City, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Montrose, Colo.

MEMBER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Major Oswala H. Ernst, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, *vice* Gillmore, deceased.

INDIAN AGENT.

John Blair, of Netawka, Kans., to be agent for the Indians of the Pottawatomie and Great Nemaha agency in Kansas.

CONSUL.

Thomas Browne, of Montana Territory, to be consul of the United States at Paramaribo.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry L. Phillips, at Seaford, Sussex County, Delaware.
James McLaughlin, at Gloucester City, Camden County, New Jersey.
John H. Middleton, at West Hoboken, Hudson County, New Jersey.
Thomas L. Crosland, at Bennettsville, Marlborough County, South Carolina.
William A. Moore, at Yorkville, York County, South Carolina.
William F. Boyle, at Freeland, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.
John S. Bryan, at Newton, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
Charles B. Crawford, at Mifflintown, Juniata County, Pennsylvania.
A. B. Herd, at Phillipsburgh, Centre County, Pennsylvania.
C. Y. White, at Eldred, McKean County, Pennsylvania.
Sherman T. Pell, at City Island, Westchester County, New York.
William E. Huttman, at Ellinwood, Barton County, Kansas.
Alexander C. Hickman, at La Junta, Bent County, Colorado.
Joseph P. Macey, at Las Animas, Bent County, Colorado.
James C. Outhouse, at Lamar, Bent County, Colorado.
Charles F. Howe, at Greenleaf, Washington County, Kansas.
Charles J. Kerndt, at Bird City, Cheyenne County, Kansas.
Taylor W. Scott, at Stafford, Stafford County, Kansas.
Matthew Thomson, at Alma, Wabaunsee County, Kansas.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1888.

POLICE COURT JUDGE.

Thomas F. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the police court of the District of Columbia.

MINISTER RESIDENT.

Robert B. Roosevelt, of New York, to be minister resident of the United States to the Netherlands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May* 16, 1888.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

HEIRS OF SOLOMON SPITZER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution originating in the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate, I return herewith the bill (H. R. 2699) entitled "An act for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 15, 1888.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the communication just read will be laid on the table for the present until the House shall determine what disposition shall be made of the bill to which it relates.

BRANCH SOLDIERS' HOME, GRANT COUNTY, INDIANA.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has withdrawn his objection to the bill which I called up yesterday, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be taken up and put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] asks unanimous consent to take up for present consideration a bill (H. R. 8391) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers in Grant County, Indiana, and for other purposes. Is the reading of the bill demanded?

Mr. McMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to hear a statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] as to the necessity for this home.

Mr. STEELE. The Committee on Military Affairs authorized me to report this bill, there being a necessity for additional homes. The Superintendent of the National Home reports that there are over nine thousand soldiers in the poor-houses, and that every single home now existing is not only full, but that soldiers are sleeping on the floors, and that there is an actual necessity for additional accommodations. In pursuance of that statement this bill has been reported from the Com-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

mittee on Military Affairs. It is proposed by the citizens of the place where the home is to be located to furnish fuel and light free for all time to come. The fuel and light at the Dayton home cost last year over $58,000, to say nothing about the cost of the cartage of ashes and débris away from the home. It is thought to be in the interest of economy that there should be a home of this character established, and established in the center of the region whence most of the soldiers came during the late war. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. The point that I was anxious to have a statement about was as to the necessity for the home. Of course, if there is a necessity for it no patriotic citizen will object, but, with a diminishing demand for such homes, which is inevitable either now or in the near future, I want to ask the gentleman whether it is certain that the creation of this new home is a necessity.

Mr. STEELE. The board of managers report that so far from there being a decreasing demand it is constantly increasing, and increasing in a very large ratio. They so state in their annual report dated the 2d of January last.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is there any other home in Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. No, sir.

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

Mr. FARQUHAR. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] whether this bill provides for the erection of a home under the auspices of the national Board of Managers; that is, will it receive soldiers from other States than Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think it would be well to have the bill read.

Mr. FARQUHAR. There is no question at all about its propriety if it contains that provision. I wish to say to the House, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], that the State of New York, through the Grand Army of the Republic, has built homes for its own soldiers, and yet there are now nearly four hundred soldiers that can not find room at the home at Bath.

Mr. STEELE. That is the condition of affairs throughout the country.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I know that is the case in my own State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has Indiana built any soldiers' homes of its own?

Mr. STEELE. It has built a soldiers' orphans' home, which is more than full now.

Mr. McMILLIN. What is the appropriation which this bill contains?

Mr. STEELE. Only $200,000.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is there a provision limiting it to that amount?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. The State of Illinois has built a soldiers' home at Springfield, a large and well-appointed institution, and is paying all the expenses of it out of the State treasury.

Mr. STEELE. So I understand.

Mr. SPRINGER. And I do not know but that if this bill passes I shall ask to have that Illinois institution turned over to the General Government.

Mr. BIGGS. I would like to have the bill read.

Mr. BURROWS. It was read yesterday.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs gave this measure very careful consideration before theyd ecided to report it favorably. There can be no reasonable objection to the bill and it ought to pass.

Mr. BIGGS. I withdraw the demand for the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. There are several amendments, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 1, line 7, strike out "three hundred and twenty" and insert "two hundred" [meaning acres of land].

Section 3, line 9, after the word "building," insert "and shall supply an adequate quantity of such gas free of cost to the Government."

Section 4, line 1, strike out "and fifty;" making the sum $200,000, instead of $250,000.

The amendments were severally 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. STEELE 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.

ABBIE SHARP.

Mr. RICE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner, be taken from the Private Calendar and put on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the sum of $2,500 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner, who was captured and whose family was killed by the Sioux Indians at Spirit Lake, in the State of Iowa, on the 8th day of March, A. D. 1857.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICE 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.

FREEDMEN OF THE CHOCTAW NATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with accompanying paper, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on the present condition of freedmen of the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, and submitting a draught of a proposed bill for their relief; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an amended estimate from the Secretary of State of the appropriation for expenses of obtaining and searching for records in French spoliation claims; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGES TO SCHOONER SARAH C. WHARF.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries of appropriation to pay damages sustained by the schooner Sarah C. Wharf by collision with the Fish Commission steamer Fish Hawk; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read a first and second time, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 2039) for the relief of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal Company—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; when the Speaker signed the same.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for the regular order. I move that the morning hour for the call of committees be dispensed with, and that gentlemen desiring to make reports may file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that to-day, immediately after the reading of the Journal, was by special order set apart for the consideration of bills and resolutions reported from the Committee on Labor. I wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] whether any arrangement has been made or is contemplated by which the business of the Labor Committee may be assigned to some other day. I make this inquiry in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Labor, and because I am unable to communicate with him.

Mr. McMILLIN. As the chairman of the committee is absent, I can not communicate with him. All I can say to the gentleman from New Jersey is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL], the chairman of the Labor Committee, introduced a day or two ago a resolution, which was properly referred, looking to the assignment of a future day for the business of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman recollect the date fixed in that resolution?

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was introduced on last Monday, and according to the recollection of the Chair it provides for the assignment of some day during next week. The Chair thinks it is the understanding that such assignment shall be made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would it be in order, then, for me to ask unanimous consent now that the execution of this special order be deferred for one week?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] yields for the motion.

Mr. McMILLIN. The chairman of the Committee on Labor has already taken steps looking to the accomplishment of the object which the gentleman from New Jersey seeks. The resolution introduced by the chairman of the committee has been regularly referred. I sympathize with the desire of the gentleman from New Jersey in regard to an assignment for that business, but I think the resolution on the subject ought to take the regular course.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The regular course, Mr. Speaker, is for the House now to proceed with the execution of the order already made; and under the regular order the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee would be

out of order, because under the special order there is no morning hour to-day.

The SPEAKER. If the Committee on Labor should call up any bill, there would be no morning hour; and unless some arrangement should be made, the only way to prevent the consideration of measures from that committee to-day would be to raise the question of consideration against each bill as called up.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no desire to prolong this discussion or to interpose any difficulty. In the absence of the chairman of the committee I simply desired to know the situation.

The SPEAKER. The question is, then, on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] ask unanimous consent that the order with reference to business of the Labor Committee be postponed for one week?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New Jersey, that there was a motion pending. The gentleman can make his request for unanimous consent if action on the pending motion be suspended.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me there ought to be some arrangement about this matter.

Mr. McMILLIN. There will be no difficulty about it. There was an understanding that a future day would be assigned. That understanding, I infer from all that has occurred, is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Labor; and therefore I have made this motion.

Mr. DINGLEY. If that is the understanding, I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the information I desired to elicit.

Mr. TARSNEY. The chairman of the committee [Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri] is here now. Let us hear from him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair ascertains that May 22 is the day designated in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The understanding between the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] and myself was that the day for the consideration of reports from the Committee on Labor should be deferred until Tuesday next.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am perfectly content.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That was the understanding.

Mr. DINGLEY. Why not ask unanimous consent now that the day which has been suggested be fixed?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I will ask unanimous consent——

Mr. McMILLIN. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules; why not let the matter rest in that shape?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It was the understanding that they would report the resolution back and give us that day.

Mr. TAULBEE. Does the committee agree to report it back?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. We understand from members of the Committee on Rules that there will be no difficulty about it.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. McMILLIN, that the morning hour for the consideration of reports be dispensed with, and that leave be granted to file reports with the Clerk, it was agreed to.

TARIFF.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, a prominent question is now agitating the public mind, which largely affects both labor and capital. Its ramifications penetrate into all the varied industries of the country, which make up the bulk of our prosperity. That one question may be summed up in the proposition that if MILLS of Texas does not shut up, most of the other mills of the country will have to. If this mention of the name of the honorable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee should be considered offensive or unparliamentary, I apologize for it in advance.

That the industries of the nation during the deluge of debate upon the tariff question have been much disturbed is thoroughly well known; and the interests involved are to-day anxiously looking for the course of legislation in Congress upon this momentous question, whether the over-swollen Treasury shall be relieved by a reduction of the tariff which at the same time will tend to paralyze the manufacturing industries, and thus produce more financial disasters than would exist were the present surplus to be maintained or increased, or whether the surplus should be reduced by a reduction in internal-revenue taxation or by the purchase and retirement of national bonds, or by a wise distribution of the surplus funds in internal improvements. This subject is well worthy the consideration of every patriotic and thoughtful man.

That the present tariff system is by no means perfect will be admitted by every one acquainted with its practical operations. Its so-called iniquities have recently been embalmed in quotations of prose and poetry by more than a score of able speakers, while another score have contended that the protective system which underlies the present tariff, inaugurated more than a century ago, under which our aggregate national wealth has increased from $13,000,000,000 in 1860 to over $43,000,000,000 in 1880, is not to be rudely overthrown by any party or power not in sympathy with that system by which our country has been so largely benefited.

This is the issue now presented before this Congress and the country and upon which the next Presidential election will undoubtedly turn, for the Democratic party which presents this tariff bill before this House and before the country have, by the message of the President elected by that party and otherwise, practically declared itself against the protective system and in favor of a modified system which they call "fair trade," but which is the opening wedge to what may properly be called free trade.

That question not only affects the manufacturing industries of the country, but it also largely affects its agricultural interests.

It is my privilege, Mr. Chairman, to represent in this Congress a district composed of one county in the State of New York, named after that honored Democrat, James Monroe, and which is the second county in the United States in point of agricultural importance, having an area of nearly 350,000 acres, and divided into nearly 6,000 farms. All the agricultural products incident to that section of the country are included in the crops of these farms, and among the live-stock are to-day nearly 60,000 sheep. While it may be true that in certain sections of our country, in the far West, that are wholly agricultural, a less active interest is felt in a protective tariff than exists in the East, this can not be said of the section which I have the honor to represent, because of its nearness to the Canadian border, where large quantities of agricultural products are raised, which under any system approximating to free trade would come directly in conflict with like products raised in Western New York.

In addition to the importance of our agricultural products our manufacturing establishments number nearly twelve hundred, affording employment to about twenty-five thousand men, to whom is paid annually about $6,000,000 in wages, while the capital invested in our manufacturing concerns amounts to about $30,000,000. The value of our farm products during the year preceding the census of 1880 was nearly $6,400,000, while the products of our manufacturing establishments aggregated but a little less than $30,000,000, and the annual consumption of material therein was about $20,000,000.

The population of Monroe County to-day is full 200,000, and is estimated to be nearer 225,000, so that it needs no argument to show that the interests of my constituency are deeply concerned in any measure proposing a change in the tariff system.

"The timidity of capital is proverbial," "Wealth is but consolidated labor." No more striking illustration of the truth of these proverbs can be had than in the fact so widely known and which has been chronicled far and wide in the press of both parties, that capital and labor throughout our country are to-day seriously agitated upon the tariff question. Men fear to embark in any new enterprise which this question affects, or even to expand enterprises already established, for fear that pending legislation may affect the security of the one or the welfare and prosperity of the other.

My district is a hive of industry, embracing the manufactures of much the larger part of all things created by the hand of man that are necessary to the comfort of mankind. In that district is consumed large quantities of the wool of Ohio, Texas, and other States, the cotton of the South, the iron and coal of Pennsylvania, the silver of the mines of New Mexico and Nevada, and the gold of California, while from our harbor, ranking second upon the south shore of Lake Ontario, is shipped immense quantities of coal from the mines of Pennsylvania and vast amounts of the products of our soil and manufactories.

We produce the choicest nursery stock, and the seeds of the rarest flowers; we compete with Europe in the finest of optical works, and in the production of some of the finer fabrics, while the clothing and shoes of the city of Rochester may be found in every city and State in our country, and upon the persons of both the rich and the poor.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that these interests, which are but a type of those found in other cities throughout the land, demand a continance of our established policy of protection, and their past prosperity and present welfare is a loud protest against the recently developed free-trade policy of the Cobden Club as exemplified by the present position of the Democratic party. We believe that a policy which has insured the success and prosperity which has made the city of Rochester famous throughout our country is good enough for the whole country and should be maintained.

There is no doubt that the inventive genius of the American nation, which gives it its foremost rank to-day among the nations of the world in all labor-saving appliances employed in manufactures, has been largely stimulated by the protective system. The Centennial Exposition of 1876, held in the city of Philadelphia, opened the eyes of many people from abroad to the wonderful resources of the United States in regard to their inventive genius, and this led to the introduction abroad of samples of many of the classes of labor-saving inventions which have there been copied and put into active use, and this has led to a large development in European countries of their manufacturing industries

and to a cheapening of labor, which has largely reduced the price of European products. So that now we are face to face with the cheap products of Europe which have been practically brought about by the protected labor and genius of the United States. The importance of this fact ought to be well understood in considering whether the protective system should be further maintained.

Free wool appears to be the corner-stone of this Democratic edifice of free-trade, with a protective tariff of 40 per cent. upon the manufactured products; but this would destroy the wool-growing industry of the United States, including the large wool interests of the State which has for one of its Representatives the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. His responsibility for this action he must settle with his constituents.

The duty on clothing wool of the cheaper class, valued at not exceeding 30 cents a pound, is 10 cents a pound; which, at the maximum value, is 33⅓ per cent. ad valorem.

The duty on manufactures of wool not specially enumerated, valued at not exceeding 80 cents a pound, is 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. Those rates, at the value stated, of 80 cents a pound, amount to 78 per cent. ad valorem. Deducting the duties of 33 per cent. on the wool leaves a net duty on the goods of 45 per cent. ad valorem. On clothing, ready-made, the duty is 5 per cent. more, or 50 per cent. ad valorem.

The duty proposed by the Mills bill (with free wool) on woolen goods not enumerated is 40 per cent. ad valorem. The value of the pretense that this proposed tariff will give cheaper clothing to the poor and the laboring class can therefore be fairly estimated, especially when it is borne in mind that the average rate of duty proposed by that bill is about 41 per cent. ad valorem.

Free wool under these circumstances means a destruction of our wool-growing interests, a reduction of duty on woolen goods not sufficient to destroy the manufacturers and entirely too small to be of any practical benefit to the laboring class. Neither the manufacturers nor the wool growers are found here clamoring for the proposed change. They are content to let well enough alone, and I have been informed by reliable sources that on some classes of goods with a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem and free wool the duty would be entirely prohibitory, because the goods can be made in the United States at a less cost than they can be made in Europe with a 40 per cent. duty added. The proposition of free wool under these circumstances is base hypocrisy so far as concerns the cheaper clothing of the laboring classes.

I have heard it stated that my distinguished and honored friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, once on a time in a city within the Republican State of Rhode Island, said that such a thing as a seamless sock has not been made in the United States, and they were only made in Europe by a secret process, the secret being carefully guarded, and that they could not possibly be made in this county, and that it is foolish to maintain the duty upon them, etc. I beg at this point to read a letter which I have received, and it is introduced to be followed by an object-lesson to my friend and to those who have been misled by his false teachings. Here is the letter, and here is the object-lesson:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *May* 14, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We take the liberty of writing you, as the member of Congress from our district to direct your attention to the effect the Mills tariff bill, if passed in its present form, would have upon the industry in which we are engaged. We employ about two hundred and fifty persons in the manufacture of seamless hosiery, and should this bill become a law would be obliged either to force our operatives to accept much less wages, or close our factory. At present prices our operatives make only a fair living, but should we be compelled to compete with the factories of Europe manufacturing similar goods, with their poorly paid labor, we can not see how they could earn enough to keep body and soul together.

We understand Mr. Mills at a meeting held on the 19th of February last, at Providence, R. I., stated that seamless hosiery was not made in this country, but manufactured entirely in Europe by a secret process. To disabuse your mind of this erroneous statement should it have come to your ears, we herewith send you a few pairs of the hose made in our factory. There are about five hundred factories in this country engaged in making these goods. All of these factories, we believe, would be seriously crippled, if not compelled to close their doors by the passage of this bill. Trusting you will use your utmost efforts to effect the defeat of this pernicious measure, we remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

ROCHESTER HOSIERY COMPANY,
By E. W. OSBURN, *President*.

Hon. CHARLES S. BAKER, *Washington, D. C.*

These goods now exhibited are of wool, protected wool, loyal wool, and are manufactured in my city. They display the colors of the American flag—red, white, and blue. If my friend will visit my city during the coming campaign I will take pleasure in making his stay pleasant in a social way, and introduce him to the factory and to the fair hands that daily turn out these goods by the thousand. The larger ones may be sufficient in size to meet the needs of any gentleman from Texas, or from any part of that warm section of our country which is so potential in the management of affairs, and which is so largely represented on the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.] If the bill now under consideration should by any unforeseen calamity become a law, the larger ones would be sufficient to hold the scant surplus left in the Treasury after a brief operation of the law if his anticipations shall be realized and he be not mistaken in the effect of his own bill, while the smaller ones would be far too ample for the scant remembrances of affection likely to be bestowed upon him at next Christmas tide by the industries he is endeavoring in his peculiar way to "assist." [Renewed laughter.] I have the honor to present these to my good friend from Texas. They will prove to him to be the only samples of free wool upon which his eyes will ever feast. [Laughter.] If he chooses he may divide these samples, sending the red ones to the President, the white ones to the Speaker, and the blue ones he may retain for himself, as typical of his feelings at the end of the session when he beholds the defeat of the measure on which he has staked the fortunes of his party. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In a speech made by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] in my city during the last Presidential canvass he had much to say about the protective policy of the political party with which he was then affiliated. He attempted to convince my people that the party to which he then belonged was not a free-trade party. I hope he will visit our city again this fall, and if he will tell the people the truth as to his former political associates (which he no doubt sadly regrets he did not do then), I assure him that the majority of 5,076 then given for the Republican ticket will be swollen to 7,500, especially if our candidate shall be able to steer clear of alliterating divines during his canvass. I but voice the sentiments of my people when advising a repeal or a material modification of internal-revenue taxes at the very earliest day practicable. They are inquisitorial in their nature, fetter the products of our own country, are antagonistic to the principles of both of the great political parties as they existed at the time of their adoption, and were only created to meet the necessities of the war—a necessity which no longer exists. [Applause.]

We would be glad to have the inequalities of the tariff revised, but it looks as if any such action will have to wait for the Fifty-first Congress to have it wisely done, as at that time I confidently expect that the party with which I have the honor to be identified will administer the reins of Government, and so shape the course of legislation. Meanwhile we may observe the entire lack of a wise and statesmanlike course pursued by our Democratic friends in upholding their professions presented to the country in other lines than those of tariff as a justification of our lack of confidence in any revision of the tariff which they could possibly make. Their so-called civil-service reform has become the laughing-stock of the country. Their administration of the postal laws and regulations, both as concerns our domestic intercourse and those affecting our intercourse with Canada, have been the subject of loud complaints from many quarters. It would seem as if that party were the lineal descendants of the gentleman who stood on the corner of one of the streets in Jerusalem and thanked God that he was not as other men were, and then went off and exemplified by his life and actions that he was below the level of his fellow-men.

The nearness of my district to the Canadian border necessarily makes intimate relations between the interests of my constituents and those of our neighbors residing upon the other side of our boundary. On the 2d day of last month I introduced a resolution into this House calling attention to the situation at that date of the breach of faith of the Canadian Government in exacting duties upon nursery stock and seeds, which were put upon our free-list in 1883. That resolution is as follows:

Whereas "Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada," did by due statutory enactment, assented to May 15, 1879, provide that "any or all of the following articles, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables, including potatoes and other roots; plants, trees, and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain; flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain; butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada;" and

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled did, by act approved March 3, 1883, duly provide that plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds, and seeds of all kinds, fresh fish, fruits, green, ripe, or dried, eggs, and a large number of articles specifically named should be admitted into the United States free of duty; in consequence whereof it appears that large quantities of plants, trees, shrubs, vines, and seeds, eggs, aggregating in value in the year 1885 $1,831,000; in the year 1886, $1,728,000; in the year 1887, $1,827,000, and great quantities of fish and other products of the Dominion of Canada have been imported into the United States duty free, while that government has neglected, failed, and refused to keep or observe Her Majesty's standing offer of reciprocity in respect of the articles specified, or of many of them, and have, as is alleged, exacted large sums by way of duty upon many of the articles specified, which have been imported into Canada from the United States; and have, as is alleged, levied and assessed ad valorem duties upon American goods at the actual retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption even when shipped, imported, and sold in large quantities at wholesale prices, notwithstanding and in disregard and violation of the spirit and letter of the Canadian statutes; and

Whereas it is claimed on the part of Canadian officials that the citizens of the United States can avail themselves of the privileges of reciprocity under the act first above quoted only after all the articles therein specified shall be admitted free of duty by United States laws: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report as speedily as practicable to this House the kinds and quantities of goods and products imported into the United States from Canada free of duty during the past five years, and also the quantities of similar goods and products exported from the United States into Canada during the same period, together with a statement in detail, showing the amount of duties, specific and ad valorem, paid thereon, to the end and purpose of ultimate recovery thereof, and of an ad-

justment of the differences resulting from such breach of faith on the part of the Canadian Government.

Resolved, further, That the Committee on Ways and Means report to the House within ten days a bill providing:

First. For an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent. upon all plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds imported into the United States from the Dominion of Canada.

Second. For a specific duty of 5 cents per dozen upon eggs so imported.

Third. For a specific duty of 1 cent a pound upon all fish so imported.

Fourth. That in all cases a duty shall be imposed upon all goods and products now on the free-list whenever similar goods and products are subject to duty under the laws of Canada, at a rate equal to that imposed thereunder.

Fifth. That ad valorem duties imposed by the laws of the United States on goods, wares, and merchandise imported from foreign countries shall be assessed upon the actual retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption in the country of production or export, whenever in the country of such production or export ad valorem duties upon goods, wares, and merchandise imported into such country from the United States are assessed upon the retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption in the United States.

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and, under the rules of the House, should have been reported within seven days, but thus far no report has been made; but, in common with the many petitions and communications that have been sent to that committee in behalf of American industries, it has, I fear, slept the sleep that knows no waking. Despairing of any action of the committee, I addressed the Canadian authorities upon the subject, and deem it but fair to state that they have since, somewhat reluctantly, declared nursery stock free, and, by a later proclamation, have also put seeds on their free-list.

Nevertheless, I am assured that there has been inaugurated in the Canadian House of Commons a measure to restore the duty upon some or all of those articles of commerce, while the people of the Dominion continue to avail themselves, and, with confidence of uninterruption, of the privileges accorded by the measures adopted by our Congress for their benefit.

During the three years last past we have paid for eggs from Canada $5,386,000, while the products of the great American hen have gone entirely unprotected.

"Can these things be, and overcome us like a summer cloud, without our special wonder?"

Early in the present session I introduced a bill to correct the injustice under which two large industries in my city suffer under the present tariff, which bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The merits of the case were made plain in a letter which I had printed and presented to the committee, which letter I will read, because it gives facts which should be understood by this House and by the country.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *January* 26, 1888.

Hon. C. S. BAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: As constituents of yours doing business at Rochester, N. Y., we desire to submit for your consideration, and through you to call the attention of Congress to certain facts and statements in support of the bill (H. R. 5660) introduced by you into the House of Representatives on January 23, 1888, to regulate the admission into the United States of photographic print-paper, which bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our business consists in the preparation of this class of paper by special treatment for the use of photographers. The plain paper of this grade is all made at two mills, one situated near Lyons, France, and the other one at Malmedy, Germany. The difficulties attendant upon its manufacture have been so great, and the consumption of the paper so comparatively small, that the two mills specified have for the past ten or fifteen years practically monopolized its manufacture and, no doubt, will continue to do so. Some efforts have been made to manufacture it in the United States, but because of the small quantity of it used and the difficulties connected with its manufacture these efforts have not been crowned with success.

From 1861 to 1883 the duty on this class of paper was 35 per cent. ad valorem, and under the tariff of 1883, now in force, it is 25 per cent., it being included under the provision for "paper not otherwise provided for," so that for over twenty-five years there has been a substantial protective duty on this class of paper, sufficient to develop its production in this country if there was any likelihood of its being made a profitable branch of industry. It is of a peculiar character, readily distinguishable from any other grade or class of paper by any expert in paper, quite as much so as "printing-paper, unsized, used for books and newspapers exclusively," or "paper sized or glued, suitable only for printing-paper," for each of which classes special provision is made in the tariff at rates of duty far below those fixed on the general class of paper not specially named in the tariff.

Photographic print paper commands a very high price, costing, delivered in New York without duty, from 50 to 55 cents per pound. When imported in sheets the name of the manufacturer is impressed in a water-mark on each sheet, and when imported in rolls the water-mark appears on every 3 feet of the roll. Aside, however, from its distinguishing characteristics, its price is so high as to make it unsuitable for any other use than its legitimate one of printing pictures from negatives taken by photographers. There would, therefore, be no danger to the revenue in giving this grade of paper a separate classification under the tariff, no more so than in the case of paper for books and newspapers and printing-paper, and the special provisions made in the tariff for these classes of paper have been attended with no difficulties in the way of their execution, the character of the paper being found to be a sufficient test to determine its classification. This statement will apply with equal force to photographic print paper.

II. Before the paper is available for the uses to which it is to be applied, it must undergo several processes. One is called albumenizing, which consists in coating the paper with the white of eggs. Another is in coating the paper with a mixture of gelatine and bromide of silver. This process is called sensitizing. The paper is imported in three conditions, namely, plain, abumenized, and sensitized. It is sold to photographers only in two conditions: first, sensitized, in which condition it is ready for use; and, second, albumenized. When sold in the latter condition the photographer himself performs the work of sensitizing. The business of albuminizing and sensitizing paper in the United States was commenced only a few years since, but has already become an important branch of industry, and with proper encouragement can be enlarged both for our own and foreign markets.

Messrs. D. Hovey's Sons, one of the firms whose names are attached hereto, are engaged in the business of albumenizing the paper, and in this work they have been accustomed to use from six hundred to a thousand dozen of eggs per day, the whites of the eggs only being used for this purpose, the yelks being barreled and shipped to Gloversville, N. Y., to be used in dressing leather for the manufacture of gloves. This gives a large market to the poultry products of that region, and is a material help to the farming interests. In their business they have been accustomed to employ as many as 100 hands, and about the same number are employed by the Eastman Company, the other firm signing this memorial. The latter firm, in their business of sensitizing paper, use about $5,000 worth of silver per month, or $60,000 per year.

The machinery they use is intricate and expensive, and it has been invented and patented by persons connected with the company. It is only by their superior processes, aided by their machinery, that they have at all been able to compete with the foreign product, the foreigners having the great advantage of cheap materials and cheap labor. In addition to supplying the home market, the Eastman Company are large exporters of coated paper, and if they could have their raw paper free and a reasonable duty on their finished product, they could command a very much larger trade abroad. They paid duty last year amounting to some $2,000 on paper which they had coated and which was exported to foreign countries, which duty was not returned to them by way of drawback.

III. The duty on both the plain paper and the coated article was originally held to be, under the tariff act of 1883, 25 per cent. ad valorem, the article, whether coated or plain, being regarded only as paper, dutiable under the provisions for "paper not otherwise provided for." This arrangement still gave the foreigner an advantage, because it enabled him to import his finished product at the same rate of duty as was imposed on the plain paper, and it was then only by our improved processes and machinery, developed at a great expenditure of time and money, that we were enabled to compete with the foreign article and thereby control a part of the home trade.

But last year the Treasury Department put in force a ruling founded on the verdict of a jury in a case brought before a United States court, that the albumenized and sensitized paper was no longer paper, but was an article which, by the distinct and additional processes it had undergone, was to be regarded as "a manufacture of paper," dutiable under the act of 1883 at only 15 per cent. ad valorem, and that ruling is still in force. This presents the anomalous condition of the finished product paying a less rate of duty than the raw material or plain paper from which it is made, and reverses all ordinary and well-established principles of tariff legislation.

It was a serious blow to an industry which, under the former condition of affairs, was already struggling for existence, and we believe that no argument is necessary to convince you or any other member of Congress that the present condition of the tariff in this respect should not be permitted to continue, but that a duty sufficient to encourage the domestic manufacturer should be placed on the coated paper, leaving the plain paper to be placed on the free-list or to bear a very low rate of duty. We do not seek to have the duty on the finished article placed so high as to increase the cost to the ultimate consumer; but we do ask that we may be placed in a position where we can furnish the article to the consumer somewhere near as cheaply as the foreigner does.

As the tariff now stands, the foreign albumenized paper can be delivered here at a cost of $5 less than the article coated in the United States. If the plain paper is put at the same rate of duty as the albumenized, the foreign article could be delivered here for $4 a ream less than the paper coated here. If the plain paper is made free of duty and the coated article is put at 15 per cent. ad valorem the cost of the foreign article would be $2.50 per ream less than that made here. If the plain paper is put at 15 per cent. ad valorem and the coated article at 25 per cent. ad valorem the foreign article can be delivered here for $2 per ream less than the home product. If the plain paper is made free of duty and the coated paper 25 per cent. ad valorem the foreign article can still be delivered here for 60 cents less than the article coated in the United States. Grouping these statements and numbering them for ready reference we have:

No. 1. (Same as now) $5 against American industry.
No. 2. (Both at 15 per cent.) $4 against.
No. 3. (Plain free, coated 15 per cent.) $2.50 against.
No. 4. (Plain 15 per cent., coated 25 per cent.) $2 against.
No. 5. (Plain free, coated 25 per cent.) 60 cents against.

The propositions that we favor the most, and which should be adopted as a matter of fairness and justice to domestic interests, are those marked three and five, in both of which the plain paper is made free and the coated paper is put at 15 or 25 per cent. ad valorem. A duty of 15 per cent. on the coated paper, with plain paper free of duty, would be a substantial benefit to us; but the only change which would really meet the situation and establish both branches of our business on a positive basis would be the admission of the plain paper free of duty, and a duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem on the coated article.

We respectfully ask that you urge upon the Committee on Ways and Means, and upon the other members of Congress, that a provision of the character last named be embodied in any tariff bill which may be adopted by Congress.

Respectfully, yours,

D. HOVEY SONS, AND
THE EASTMAN DRY-PLATE AND FILM CO.,
Of Rochester, New York.

This communication, as well as the bill introduced by me to correct that manifest injustice, like the resolution before mentioned, are both enjoying that endless sleep in the committee-room so fatal to many other remonstrances of like character. The Mills bill takes no notice of the proposed measure, nor does it propose to interfere with the foreign productions of which my friends are competitors, though one of the firms signing the petition uses one thousand dozen of eggs a week in the process of albumenizing photographic paper, and the other uses $5,000 worth of silver a month in sensitizing paper for use in photography.

Is it good policy to allow such industries to languish and die, employing as they do about two hundred hands, on which some seven hundred or more people are dependent for their daily bread? I say, and with a reverential spirit, that the prayer taught us by our Divine Master is, "Give us this day our daily bread," but that is subject to the caution that the Lord helps those who help themselves, and to the further command that charity, which is the greatest of all virtues, begins at home.

I do not intend to fail in impressing upon this House, even at the hazard of repetition, the importance of the relations which exist between Western New York and Canada. And on that point it will be well to observe the recent master stroke of diplomacy by which our Postmaster-General, coming as he does from that State where rural and backwoods simplicity not wholly Jeffersonian is supposed to prevail,

has secured an amendment to the recent postal treaty between our Government and the Dominion of Canada, by which the rates of postage on merchandise both ways are largely increased, and for which the people of both countries will undoubtedly bless their respective but not respected Postmasters-General. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Executive Document 293, of May 3, is respectfully recommended to the House and the country for consideration in this connection. Nor must I fail to mention the policy our Canadian friends have seen fit to pursue in the matter of their valuation of our imports. I have caused to be examined the various tariffs of the nations of the world, and, so far as they make distinct mention of the subject, they are in accord with our own, which fixes the ad valorem duties upon the wholesale price of the commodity in the markets of the country of production. This rule is in accordance with the laws of trade, as all commercial transactions of any moment are based on that rule. But Canada has seen fit to make a very harassing exception to this rule, and imposes her duties upon the retail value at which the goods are sold for consumption in the countries of production, and as the United States in the great bulk of her common necessities is the only country she has to deal with, it means an assessment of duty upon the retail value, the value at which goods enter into daily consumption in the homes, and not in the markets, of the United States.

The New York Tribune of Monday, May 14, instant, contained an able letter by Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., upon the subject of our commercial relations with Canada, which should be read by every one. In his comments upon that letter the editor, in the same issue, said:

OUR NORTHERN NEIGHBOR.

Mr. Nimmo's letter published on another page contains information that is greatly needed by Congress and the country. It treats of the relations of the Dominion of Canada to Great Britain and the United States, and of various violations of treaty law and covenanted reciprocity. Senator FRYE late in January sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations resolutions of inquiry respecting these abuses, and this letter virtually supplies the information which was then called for. It also refers in detail to the grievances which Representatives DINGLEY, NUTTING, and BAKER have brought to light in the House. Mr. Nimmo is not only master of the subject, but also of his temper. The relations of the Dominion to the United States are discussed with as much dignity as intelligence, and his statements of fact are not vitiated by a single unfriendly expression or the faintest reference to the subject of annexation.

Some of the specific counts in the indictment against Canada may be briefly mentioned. By an order of council a rebate of 18 cents per ton has been allowed on the tolls on grain passing through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, if shipment be made to Montreal. This is a premium offered for the diversion of American commerce from American seaports and transportation lines. This is an open infraction of article 27 of the treaty of Washington, and should be met by the immediate imposition of a tonnage tax on all Canadian vessels passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. In like manner the international arrangements relating to the transit trade, which is of immense value to Canadian corporations, are violated in Manitoba, where the Dominion Government refuses to allow grain to be shipped in bond over American railroads to Montreal. For five years Canada has failed to place on the free-list various articles from which duty was entirely taken off in the United States when the tariff was revised; and this neglect is in direct violation of an act passed by the Dominion Parliament in 1879 providing for reciprocity in this respect whenever the same articles should be admitted from Canada without payment of duty. Other instances of bad faith are given in connection with a brief summary of the denial of commercial privileges to American fishermen in Canadian harbors.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: Canada has been allowed to impose upon the forbearance and good nature of the United States. The restraints of international law and the engagements of reciprocal compacts do not interfere with sharp practice by which temporary advantages may be secured for the commerce of the Dominion. The ambitious designs of Canada have been pursued in a particularly aggressive spirit since the present Administration has been in power in Washington. Its Government and railway corporations have acted on the principle that any favor that might be wanted would readily be granted by the State and Treasury Departments, and that no indignities or outrages offered to fishermen would be resented, and that no commercial privileges withheld in violation of positive engagements would be demanded under menace of retaliation. The time is rapidly approaching when retaliation must be the anwer to every act of injustice and every infringement upon the principles of international comity. Canada, by persisting in taking advantage of American tolerance and magnanimity, must in the end exhaust the patience of the powerful nation which freely and generously shares with it all the advantages of its geographical position.

I take pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in commending to this House and to the country these matters, believing that if the people's Representatives much longer neglect their duty in respect of these things, the people will in thunder tones be heard in condemnation of all those who by vote and voice shall strike down our American industries for the benefit of those of Canada or of any other Government.

Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, are we as a nation ready to admit the people and the industries of Canada or of any other country to all the rights, benefits, and privileges of our country; to the enjoyment without let or hinderance of our markets upon the thin pretext that we must needs have a free foreign market for our surplus products, and without imposing any of the duties and obligations under which every American citizen rests?

It has been stated that England's labor produces in twelve days all that is required for a year's consumption. If that be true, what wonder, then, that England, backed by her Cobden Club and her American allies, should engage in the great effort now being made to command the markets of the New World for the surplus of her cheap and underpaid labor? The debate upon this all-absorbing topic, able, exhaustive, destined, in my judgment, to rank as the greatest of modern times, has impressed me as calling for but one of two results. While the pending bill professes to be only a modification of the existing tariff the logic of all the arguments in favor of it is irresistably towards free trade by the shortest route possible under existing circumstances.

While the voice of the great masses who unfortunately are represented by the minority upon this floor is overwhelmingly opposed to the bill "as tending to break down the barriers which defend American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, and to reduce the families of the American workingmen to the foreign level of cheapness and poverty," I may be permitted at this point to introduce tables (for which I am indebted to our worthy Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Col. W. F. Switzler) illustrating the comparative weight of influence of those now asserting the right to control the future of our American industries as against the great North, the West, and the East, where the bulk of our industries are located. If the gentlemen now engaged in this "great rebellion" against the prosperity of our industrial interests would display equal zeal in inviting the industry and enterprise that have combined to make us great as a nation to locate in and spread over the "Sunny South," we should see in less than a decade a new order of things there, and the Cobden Club would look in vain for recruits upon the floors of Congress.

Observe these tables. They are freighted with interesting and suggestive figures.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1888.

SIR: In compliance with your request, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith the following tables, compiled from the census of 1880, to wit:

Table A, showing the value of farm products in each State and Territory of the United States.

Table B, showing the capital invested, number of employés, amount of wages paid, and value of the products of manufactures in each State and Territory of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

WM. F. SWITZLER,
Chief of Bureau.

Hon. CHARLES S. BAKER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

A.—*Table showing the value of farm productions in each State and Territory of the United States according to the census of* 1880.

States and Territories.	Estimated value of all farm productions.
Alabama	$56, 872, 994
Arkansas	43, 796, 261
Delaware	6, 320, 345
Florida	7, 439, 392
Georgia	67, 028, 929
Kentucky	63, 850, 155
Louisiana	42, 883, 522
Maryland	28, 839, 281
Mississippi	63, 701, 844
Missouri	95, 912, 660
North Carolina	51, 729, 611
South Carolina	41, 108, 112
Tennessee	62, 076, 311
Texas	65, 204, 329
Virginia	45, 726, 221
West Virginia	19, 360, 049
Total Southern	761, 850, 016
Connecticut	18, 010, 075
Maine	21, 945, 489
Massachusetts	24, 160, 881
New Hampshire	13, 474, 330
Rhode Island	3, 670, 135
Vermont	22, 082, 656
Total New England	103, 343, 566
Arizona	614, 327
California	59, 721, 425
Colorado	5, 035, 228
Dakota	5, 648, 814
District of Columbia	514, 441
Idaho	1, 515, 314
Illinois	203, 980, 137
Indiana	114, 707, 082
Iowa	136, 103, 473
Kansas	52, 240, 361
Michigan	91, 159, 858
Minnesota	49, 468, 951
Montana	2, 024, 923
Nebraska	31, 708, 914
Nevada	2, 855, 449
New Jersey	29, 650, 756
New Mexico	1, 897, 974
New York	178, 025, 695
Ohio	156, 777, 152
Oregon	13, 234, 548
Pennsylvania	129, 760, 476
Utah	3, 337, 410
Washington	4, 212, 750
Wisconsin	72, 779, 496
Wyoming	372, 391
Total all other	1, 347, 347, 345
Total United States	2, 212, 540, 927

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *May* 15, 1888.

B.—*Table showing the capital invested, the number of employés, the amount of wages paid, and the value of the products of manufactures in each State and Territory of the United States, according to the census of* 1880.

States and Territories.	Capital invested.	Number of employés.	Amount of wages paid.	Value of products.	Population.
Alabama	$9,668,008	10,019	$2,500,504	$13,565,504	1,262,505
Arkansas	2,953,130	4,557	925,358	6,756,159	802,525
Delaware	15,655,822	12,638	4,267,349	20,514,438	146,608
Florida	3,210,680	5,504	1,270,875	5,546,448	269,493
Georgia	20,672,410	24,875	5,266,152	36,440,938	1,542,180
Kentucky	45,813,039	37,391	11,657,844	75,483,377	1,648,690
Louisiana	11,462,468	12,167	4,360,371	24,205,183	939,946
Maryland	58,742,384	74,945	18,904,965	106,708,563	934,943
Mississippi	4,727,600	5,827	1,192,645	7,518,302	1,131,597
Missouri	72,507,844	63,995	24,309,716	165,386,205	2,168,380
North Carolina	13,045,639	18,109	2,740,768	20,095,037	1,399,750
South Carolina	11,205,894	22,128	2,836,289	15,738,008	995,577
Tennessee	20,092,845	22,445	5,254,775	37,074,886	1,542,359
Texas	9,245,561	12,159	3,343,087	20,719,928	1,591,749
Virginia	26,968,990	40,184	7,425,261	51,780,992	1,512,565
West Virgina	13,883,390	14,311	4,313,965	22,867,126	618,457
Total Southern States	339,855,704	381,254	100,569,924	631,473,104	18,507,324
Connecticut	120,480,275	112,915	43,501,518	185,697,211	622,700
Maine	49,988,171	52,954	13,623,318	79,829,793	648,936
Massachusetts	303,806,185	352,255	128,315,362	631,135,284	1,783,085
New Hampshire	51,112,263	48,831	14,814,793	73,978,028	346,991
Rhode Island	75,575,943	62,878	21,355,619	104,163,621	276,531
Vermont	23,265,224	17,540	5,164,479	31,354,366	332,286
Total New England States	624,228,061	647,373	226,775,089	1,106,158,303	4,010,529
Arizona	272,600	220	111,180	618,365	40,440
California	61,243,784	43,693	21,065,905	116,218,973	864,694
Colorado	4,311,714	5,074	2,314,427	14,260,159	194,327
Dakota	771,428	868	339,375	2,373,970	135,177
District of Columbia	5,552,526	7,146	3,924,612	11,882,316	177,624
Idaho	677,215	388	136,326	1,271,317	32,610
Illinois	140,652,066	144,727	57,429,085	414,864,673	3,077,871
Indiana	65,442,962	69,508	21,960,888	148,006,411	1,978,301
Iowa	33,987,886	28,372	9,725,962	71,045,926	1,624,615
Kansas	11,192,315	12,062	3,995,010	30,843,777	996,096
Michigan	92,930,959	77,591	25,313,682	150,715,025	1,636,937
Minnesota	31,004,811	21,247	8,613,094	76,065,198	780,773
Montana	899,390	578	318,759	1,835,867	39,159
Nebraska	4,881,150	4,793	1,742,311	12,627,336	452,402
Nevada	1,323,300	577	461,807	2,179,626	62,266
New Jersey	106,226,593	126,038	46,083,045	234,380,236	1,131,116
New Mexico	463,275	557	218,731	1,284,846	119,565
New York	514,246,575	531,533	198,634,029	1,080,696,596	5,082,871
Ohio	188,939,614	183,609	62,103,800	348,298,390	3,198,062
Oregon	6,312,056	3,473	1,667,046	10,931,232	174,768
Pennsylvania	474,510,993	387,072	134,055,904	744,818,445	4,282,891
Utah	2,656,657	2,495	858,863	4,324,992	143,963
Washington	3,202,497	1,147	532,226	3,250,134	75,116
Wisconsin	73,821,802	57,109	18,814,917	128,235,489	1,315,497
Wyoming	364,673	391	187,798	898,494	20,789
Total all other States	2,526,188,841	1,710,260	620,608,782	3,631,947,784	27,637,930
Total United States	2,790,272,606	2,738,895	947,953,795	5,369,579,191	50,155,783

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *May* 15, 1888.

Therefore, whenever the tariff is properly revised, whether in its rates of duty or in its administrative provisions, it should be revised by its friends, it should be done carefully and discreetly and with a reference to the wants of our people rather than to those of foreign nations, who, however they may supply us with their surplus of population, have no identity of interest with us and have no right to absorb our surplus of wealth by methods of legalized injustice.

That the bill now before us is not an honest bill will, I think, be apparent to any unprejudiced mind that gives it proper consideration. It covers only a portion of the tariff and laps over on to the tariff of 1883, and so will produce perplexing questions for the Department and the courts as to what commodities are dutiable under the old tariff and what under the new.

It would undoubtedly place ores not specified, in the free-list, because the provision for "mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought" at lines 130 and 131 of the free-list are amply sufficient to cover all ores not specified, even though such ores may be mentioned in the prior tariff, as it is a familiar principle of law that where a statute covers the same ground as that previously in existence and which is repugnant thereto the former statute is repealed. If this action was intended, why not come out and declare iron and other ores on the free-list; if it was not so intended, why not make it so plain that even a Democrat appointed to sit at the receipt of custom by this severely honest Administration may not administer it without dispute?

Many features of the bill seem to indicate a series of "strikes and trades." First, strike either by omission or commission some prominent branch of industry. Then wait and see what support can be gathered to the other part of the bill by correcting what was inserted or by supplying what was omitted.

The sugar of Louisiana was prominently attacked in the bill first produced, as well as the sugar-refining industry, by a "strike" against the drawback on refined sugar, and then when the proper "trade" has been had the "strike" was struck out, and the sugar schedule was amended to meet the wants of those whose votes were desired.

The sunny section of the South was thus largely favored, as were also the interests of that section, by placing cotton-ties for the baling of cotton on the free-list, and enhancing the duty on rice, which is produced exclusively below the now happily obliterated line which formerly marked the "sections" of this country.

Fair play is a jewel, but no such glittering gem appears to have adorned the breast of our Democratic neighbors when defining their position on this great question. [Applause.]

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Considering only the facts and the necessities surrounding us, I shall most regretfully be compelled to object.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for making the request, but I had about concluded what I desired to say.

Mr. BOUND. Mr. Chairman, during the past two weeks of tariff discussion in the House I have been confined to my home by a very severe inflammation of one of my eyes, in consequence of which I have not only been prevented from attending the regular sessions of Congress, but also deprived of the pleasure of perusing the debates on the tariff, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of about $5,000 to $8,000 a day to our heavily burdened tax-payers! Whether I am to be congratulated or commiserated with on this account I leave entirely to the judgment of my more fortunate brethren who were able to be present. Permit me to say, however, in this connection, that I do not believe that anything that has been said, or that may hereafter be uttered upon this floor, will have the slightest effect in changing or altering the vote of a single member in regard to the Mills tariff bill! King Caucus has laid down the programme to be followed by the majority, and if the party lash can effect it—if the power and patronage of the Executive can accomplish it—no change nor alteration in any important provision of this bill will be allowed by the majority.

Thus believing, it would seem to be the part of wisdom to remain silent and content myself with voting against this iniquitous tariff bill as a whole, and every part thereof. But, sir, coming as I do from one of the largest mining and manufacturing districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and feeling a deep interest in the prosperity, happiness, and permanent welfare of a generous constituency, I would consider myself false and recreant to every obligation devolving upon me as their representative if I failed to denounce this pro-British, free-trade tariff bill as it deserves. This bill is a long stride in the direction of free trade, and is the inauguration of a tariff policy that must eventually prove ruinous and disastrous to many important industries in which my people are largely interested!

Sir, the President of the United States has boldly demanded tariff reduction in his annual message, and, no matter how seriously the business interests of the country may be affected thereby, commands his Democratic followers to see that his wishes are complied with. He informs them that there is a large and a largely increasing surplus of money in the Treasury, and that it must be reduced. Sir, it may be a great misfortune to be blessed with too much money! But, sir, is this our only danger as a people? Would it not be a far greater evil to close up our rolling-mills, furnaces, forges, factories, and workshops? Would it not be far more terrible to stop the busy hum of industry in our mines, our factories and workshops, and turn thousands and tens of thousands of honest workmen out of remunerative employment? That, in my opinion, would be a very poor way to reduce the surplus—stop the factories and open the poor-houses!

Sir, I am glad of one thing, and thank the President for tearing the mask from the faces of his Democratic free-trade followers. One thing is absolutely certain; we will have no such cries nor banners in Pennsylvania emblazoned with a living lie at next election as "Polk, Dallas, Shunk, and the tariff of '42; we dare the Whigs to repeal it!" We will have no "favorite son of Pennsylvania" deceiving our honest laboring men, mechanics, and artisans with the shameless cry that "James K. Polk is a better tariff man than Henry Clay!" And our people will see to it that no other recreant son of Pennsylvania, nor of any other State in the Union, will give a casting vote in the United States Senate by which free trade is established as the law of the land and ruin and desolation brought to our firesides and hearth-stones in the great Keystone State.

Our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] will hardly have the effrontery to parade this free-trade banner in the great manufacturing States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut before the workingmen as the gonfalon of protection to American industry. He can not again with any consistency, nor without belying his past record, even try to save those States to the Democratic party next fall, as he did four years ago! If the Democratic party intends to com-

mit political hari-kari by passing the Mills tariff bill, I feel very sure that brother RANDALL will hardly be one of the chief mourners at the sad obsequies!

Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist from principle. I was born and raised in a State that is wedded to the protective policy. We have witnessed, enjoyed, and greatly profited by reason of protection to American industry. We have grown great and powerful and wealthy through the fostering care of the National Government. Our infant industries have grown to a stalwart manhood, and to-day—I say it with pride—there is no State in the Union that is so thoroughly independent and self-reliant, and none that can so well withstand the assaults upon American industry, American laboring men, and American mechanics and artisans as the grand old Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And as we owe so much to wise legislation on the part of the National Government, we of the Keystone State wish to see our sister Commonwealths, through the same beneficent policy of protection, in like manner grow great and powerful and wealthy by continuing in the same line of policy.

Mr. Chairman, only a few short years ago we in Pennsylvania looked with some apprehension upon the giant strides made by Alabama in developing her great iron industries. With her vast mineral deposits developed, with her coal and iron ore and limestone lying together in such close proximity, with her cheap labor and her cheap food, her hospitable climate, enabling her mechanics and artisans and laboring men to toil in the open air all the year round, requiring but little shelter and less clothing than we of the inhospitable North, it became a serious problem just how soon Selma, and Bessemer, and Birmingham would become the Pittsburghs and Johnstowns of Pennsylvania. And, sir, but for the discovery of natural gas and its adaptability to manufacturing purposes the problem would not long have remained unsolved. Natural gas has revolutionized the iron industry in Pennsylvania to such an extent that the manufacture of flat, and bar, and round iron east of the Alleghanies has ceased to be profitable unless the works are favorably located.

Mr. Chairman, I live in one of the great mining and manufacturing districts of Pennsylvania. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in mining and manufacturing. In the counties of Northumberland and Dauphin we have vast deposits of anthracite coal, in the county of Lebanon, the other county composing my Congressional district, we have mountains of iron ore, the Cornwall iron mines, near the city of Lebanon, alone having turned out over 8,000,000 tons of iron ore since they were opened, and the supply is simply inexhaustible.

I was born and raised in the county of Northumberland and can speak from actual knowledge and experience of the coal and iron industries in that county, and that kind of knowledge is of far more practical importance than all the diaphanous theories of free-trade dreamers. Over fifty years of knowledge and experience in the coal and iron trade of my district entitle me to speak with some degree of assurance. And this brings me to the consideration of the Mills tariff bill, the President's message, and the question of wages, and the rights of labor likely to be affected thereby.

Mr. Chairman, almost my sole interest in this tariff question consists in its effects and relations to labor and the rights of the laboring man as affected thereby. I have been a laboring man all my life, and this makes me stand close beside the toiling millions in all their efforts to elevate the dignity of labor, and share in its just rewards. And here let me add that in every struggle betwixt capital and labor all my sympathies and all my yearnings are with the laboring classes. I care but little for the capitalist in this struggle, for capital is always able to take care of itself. But just in so far as the interests of capital and labor are closely identified I am the friend of both. There ought not to be any real antagonism between capital and labor, and there is none except when purse-proud avarice would rob labor of her rights and refuses to share with labor her rightful earnings. You may do as you please and vote as you please and legislate as you choose, but if your legislation is not in the interests of labor and for higher wages and better pay for the laboring man my voice and vote will be unalterably against you.

The President of the United States, in his annual message to Congress, talks very glibly about the reduced price of goods compensating for any reduction in wages which might be brought about by his tariff policy. And this is to a great extent the stock in trade of the free-trade theorists. With a million men to-day standing idle in the labor market begging for employment, with their wives and children begging for bread, the Chief Magistrate of this great Republic, with an annual salary of $50,000 at his back, coldly reasons about cheaper food and cheaper clothing making up for cheap wages, or even no wages at all. Why, sir, if a man is penniless and brown-stone fronts were selling for a farthing apiece, a poor starving devil could not raise money enough to buy a door-knob!

Others of these tariff reformers, who wish to equalize the wages of labor throughout the world by free trade, are eloquent in their praises of the farmer and planter; that they alone are the real producers of all wealth. They are full of Horace Greeley's gush about "going West, young man." This is all very nice; but if the young man has not money enough to buy a loaf of bread, what is the use of taunting him and his family of children, if he has any, with the delusive advice to go West? Why, sir, so many of them have gone there in this plight, that after working hard for years they find their farms embellished with a first-class mortgage and all their hard earnings in the hands of money-sharks.

Oh, yes, cheap goods and cheap products of the workshop and the farm are the things to make men happy and contented with their lot in life. I deny it utterly. Adults, with no one dependent upon them, may be satisfied with a bare living. But, sir, the wage-worker, the toiler in summer's lassitude and winter's frosts and snows, wants more than a living. He wants something for old age—something for his children. Besides being fed and clothed they want books to read, and pens and ink and paper and pencil; they want an education with which to fight life's battle. No matter how poor a man or a woman is, he does not live for himself alone. This is a land of great opportunities. The beggar on the dung-hill to-day may be the man of destiny to-morrow. God-given genius is our only patent of nobility in this land of equal sovereigns. A man may be great in spite of all obstacles, a child may rise to power and place from the almshouse, and in progress of time "fill the sounding trump of fame" with the record of his grand achievements; but, sir, without money, without friends, without education, he is far more likely to fill a felon's cell or a pauper's grave, than to rise to power and station and fame.

Sir, go talk to the toilers in the iron hills and coal mountains of Pennsylvania and Virginia, or the bituminous-coal deposits of the great West about the advantages of cheap food, and cheap clothing, and cheap commodities of every description, and they will tell you very quickly that what they want is steady employment and good wages and they will take care of the food and clothing part of this whole business.

For myself, I say to you very frankly that I am opposed to cheap goods and cheap agricultural products. Cheap goods and cheap products mean cheap labor—starvation wages for toiling slaves, without hope and without ambition for the future. Huts, and hovels, and nakedness, and pauperism, and crime follow sadly after the procession of cheap labor.

Need I point to downtrodden Ireland in proof of this—stripped bare and naked by the accursed greed and avarice of free-trade England? Need I further point to the grain fields of Egypt, and the cotton and rice fields of India, where the miserable coolies at the point of English bayonets and the mouths of English cannon are compelled to labor for unpaid toil? And this is the kind of labor and the kind of toil that you farmers of the great West are compelled to compete with in the markets of the world! Laborers who toil from sun, to sun, with breechclouts for raiment, with mud hovels and bamboo huts for dwelling-places, and a handful of rice for their daily food; such is the banquet that free-trade England invites you to sit down to, farmers of America!

No, sir; give the laboring man, the mechanic, and the artisan steady employment at decent wages, and he will find a pleasant home for his wife and children, decent clothing for their bodies, wholesome food for their stomachs, and all the necessaries and many of the luxuries of life. With good wages, you may hold your souls in patience, for the laboring man will neither starve himself nor allow his family to want as long as he is blessed with health and strength to work.

Yes, you may prate about cheap imported goods manufactured in the noisome factories of Leeds, and Sheffield and Birmingham. You may talk about the cheap products of foreign paupers and of convict laborers, and how they will compensate for the reduced wages of honest American mechanics brought into competition in their production and thrown upon the American markets by a low tariff or no tariff at all; but you can not fool intelligent American workingmen by any such stuff. They understand just as well as you do that $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 worth of such goods thrown upon the American market takes the place of just that many million dollars' worth of American fabrics and robs the American mechanic and artisan of the profit of just that amount of labor. And the million of American laborers standing idle to-day, waiting for employment, know that their chances are lessened just the amount of labor necessary to make those goods in foreign countries.

More than this, they know full well that the beggarly daily pittance paid the hands to fabricate those goods—less than half of what American mechanics would work for in this country—is paid for a day's work of twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours! Some gentleman on the other side of this Chamber likened the protective policy to a Chinese wall. A Chinese wall, indeed! Why, sir, rather than see the wheat of India brought into the port of New York to compete with the products of the American farmers, rather than see this country flooded with foreign goods, wares, and merchandise and the wages of American mechanics and workingmen brought down to the level of Continental Europe, Asia, Africa, and China and Japan, instead of a Chinese wall I would rather see the great Atlantic Ocean turned into a sea of fire. What do we care for the trade of Europe? What do our farmers care for it? There is not a tenth of our agricultural products shipped abroad.

Oh, yes, our friends on the other side have become great admirers of our merchant marine. They want to see the flag of the Republic float upon every sea and ocean. They are always ballooning, struggling after the unattainable. Oh, yes, build up a grand merchant marine that will command the markets of the world! Why, sir, if it was left to those gentleman from the South on the Ways and Means Committee

to build a merchant fleet, if it was left to the States which they represent, with their great lines of seacoast in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and their wonderful harbors and ports of entry, judging of the future by the past, it would take them about a thousand years to fit up an ordinary canal-boat! What is the use of all this fooling; whenever we want a foreign merchant marine we will build it.

Whenever it is made apparent that foreign trade and commerce are more profitable than our coastwise trade, whenever it is made manifest that our capital can be better and more profitably employed in constructing a merchant marine to engage in foreign trade, just that soon, and no sooner, will ships be built for the purpose, just that soon will every sea and lake and ocean in foreign lands be whitened with the sails of American commerce! Whenever the foreign carrying trade becomes sufficiently profitable to challenge American enterprise the ship-yards of all New England will resound with the busy hum of industry.

Do not misunderstand me. I am by no means opposed to the putting forth of every effort to acquire foreign trade, and especially in Central and South America. Indeed, it is a reproach to this great Republic that we do not to-day control that valuable trade. We are their best customers, and every year the balance of trade is steadily against us; whilst England, 3,000 miles farther removed from us, by reason of a liberal and enlightened trade policy, not only controls that trade, but always has a balance of trade in her favor. Sir, had that matchless statesman and thorough American, James G. Blaine, been elected to the Presidency instead of Grover Cleveland, four years ago, that valuable trade would now have been assured to us by wise treaty and close commercial intercourse so irrevocably that all of our surplus manufactures would have found a ready and profitable market, to the great advantage of American mechanics, artisans, and capitalists.

But I am diverging. I want to tell you why I am in favor of a protective tariff. In my native county, thirty years ago, the Shamokin coal region was almost a barren waste, a region of stunted timber growing on the sides of rugged hills and mountains, so destitute of soil that the wonder was how the trees and shrubs managed to exist amidst the rocks and stones. The land was so poor and barren that it would have bankrupted any ordinary man to pay the taxes! Indeed, year after year the lands were disposed of at treasurer's sales for default in payment of taxes, and to-day many of the most valuable coal tracts are held by tax-titles. Had you traveled through that region forty years ago you would hardly have taken the lands as a gift. To-day they are worth the wealth of empires!

We have coal enough to warm all our friends, and iron enough to welcome all our enemies "with bloody hands to hospitable graves," as witness the heights of Gettysburgh and the bloody plains of Antietam. To-day large towns and cities cover those stony hillsides filled with a thrifty, industrious, enterprising population. Towns of ten and twelve thousand inhabitants. In fact the whole region is a succession of towns and villages from Shamokin on the north to Port Clinton and Pottsville on the south and east. The region is literally gridironed with railroads, bearing to Eastern markets the black diamonds from the Shamokin and Schuylkill coal basins. Sir, without a protective tariff that whole region, whose wealth is reckoned in hundreds of millions, would still be a comparative wilderness.

What has accomplished this wonderful transformation? Labor, and capital, and enterprise. Sir, the glare from workshops, furnaces, and rolling-mills makes the darkest night almost as light as the noon-day sun. And the wierd forms of the stalwart men with lanterns on their hats who go down into the coal mines seeking dusky diamonds—and the gleam from the rolling-mills, furnaces, and factories illuminate the workman's manly forms stripped to the waist as they toil at the puddling furnaces looking more like gnomes and genii than things of flesh and blood. Every town and city in that vast region, every railroad train, every breaker and colliery filled with busy workmen, every house and business place, every school, and college, and hospital, and cathedral speaks in eloquent praise of the doctrine of protection to American industry.

Sir, visionary theorists may crack their throats in proclaiming the beauties of free trade, every scribbler and babbler may rant about robber tariffs, but it takes capital, and labor, and enterprise to transmute the yellow ore into iron bars. Our mechanics and miners and artisans understand these things well, and our farmers understand them well in the greatly enhanced value of their farm products.

My home is in the northern part of Northumberland County, in the beautiful valley of the Susquehanna, as rich and fertile in agricultural resources as the Shamokin region is in mineral wealth. There and in the Lackawanna region our farmers find a home market for all their surplus wheat and small grains, their fruits and butter and eggs and poultry. We ship little or nothing to the great Eastern cities, because at less cost of transportation we find a better market in the coal regions.

Why, sir, before these regions were opened up and railroads constructed I remember well that butter used to sell the year round for from 8 to 10 cents a pound, and eggs for 3 to 8 cents a dozen, chickens and ducks for 25 cents a pair, hay for from $6 to $8 a ton, and oats and corn in like proportion; potatoes for 25 cents a bushel, and no sale for these products at any price. To-day and for years past eggs average 25 cents a dozen, butter 30 to 40 cents a pound the year round, and potatoes 50 cents a bushel, and our farmers have a ready market for all they can raise; and during all this time farm lands have more than doubled and trebled in value.

More than this, twenty-odd years ago we in the agricultural portions of our county were obliged to bear the burden of taxation. The truth was that the undeveloped coal region was too poor to pay any considerable portion of the county rates and levies. To-day and for years that region of country pays much the largest share of our county taxes. And just so it is throughout the length and breadth of our great Commonwealth; the coal regions and the iron regions, and the great manufacturing towns and cities, beside furnishing our farmers with a good home market for their products, bear far the largest share of all local taxation. Our railroads and canals and our great corporations pay the largest share of our public burdens, and in another year we mean to make them pay all the expenses of our State government. And but for a protective tariff these great carrying companies would never even have had an existence.

Mr. Chairman, in the neighborhood of all our great manufacturing centers, such as Lebanon, Harrisburg, and Steelton, in my district, farm lands have appreciated in value from 100 to 500 per cent. Why, sir, not many years ago the town site of the borough of Steelton was a quagmire and swamp; to-day you will find raw material and manufactured products lying stacked upon the ground worth in money millions of dollars, and you could not buy a town lot in the heart of the city for what you could have purchased the whole town site for thirty years ago. All this phenomenal growth is due to protection. And so it is throughout our entire State.

Facts like these speak far more eloquently than all the gauzy theories of free-trade dreamers. And so it is, and so it will be throughout all this broad land of ours, in the neighborhood of all great manufacturing centers. And so it will be in the great South with all her agricultural sylvan, and mineral wealth. As it is at Selma and Bessemer and Birmingham so will it be throughout all the Southern and Western States.

On Saturday last I heard the eccentric gentleman from Mississippi complaining that our robber protective tariff made the cotton planters of his State pay 47 per cent. to New England, and to old England also, in order to have her cotton crop manufactured.

Did it never occur to the gentleman that by establishing cotton factories in his State convenient to the great cotton fields that he could not only save this 47 per cent. to his own people, to say nothing of the cost of transporting the cotton crop from Mississippi to either New England or old England? And in such case they could skin the New England Yankees instead of being skinned by them! I know croaking and complaining will never do it; but capital and thrift, and energy and enterprise, will do it just as it is done in New England, or in Liverpool, or Birmingham. But you can never do it as long as you belittle and degrade labor. You can never do it as long as you lie on your backs and dream as to whether or not it is better to own labor or hire labor.

You will never get skilled mechanics and artisans, either from New England or old England, to work in the cotton fields or cotton factories of Mississippi for unpaid toil. You will not get free white labor from the North to work fourteen or sixteen hours a day for 50 cents a day. The truth of the matter is you are a quarter of a century behind the age; you have never gotten over the idea of the cheap labor of your proslavery days, and you will never see genuine prosperity dawn upon you in the South until you do. Indolence and cheap labor are the curse of the planting States of the South, and the delusion of cheap goods and free trade are the bane of your existence as a people. Elevate the dignity of labor, pay the toiler an honest price for his toil, and prosperity and happiness will be your reward.

The New South, thank God! is just awakening to a true realization of all her grand possibilities. There is no room for croakers and fault-finders there. You must get out of the way or be ground to powder under the wheels of progress! Quit brooding and worrying over the dead past, and try to realize the fact that this is an age of wonderful business activity. Try to catch on as the train of progress passes by, or you will surely be left behind. Stop bothering about how much o the robber-tariff money the poor laboring men have laid up in the Massachusetts savings-banks. Get your laboring men to follow their example; and if you will only pay them decent wages, they will have good bank accounts too.

The truth of the matter is there is little or none of your money in their savings! Why, the mass of your people do not buy enough nor consume enough to furnish New England nor Old England much profit either. You hardly import enough goods into the port of Charleston to pay the salaries of the customs officers! The Northern, Eastern, Middle, and Western States pay the great bulk of the robber-tariff duties, and they are not complaining about it either. Start up cotton and woolen and iron mills, pay your mechanics living wages, keep your money at home, and you will find large balances to labor's credit in Southern savings-banks!

Mr. Chairman, if the protective features of the existing tariff are not striken down, as proposed in the Mills bill, by this House and our

ports thrown open to unlimited importations of foreign merchandise, the New South to-day is just standing upon the threshold of her greatest prosperity. Before her are just now opening vistas of wealth and prosperity such as were never dreamed of in the dark days of slavery and sloth and indolence. Strike down the protective system and how soon all your bright hopes will be clouded and dissipated. Capital, which is now eagerly seeking investment in your midst—always cowardly—will leave you as if fleeing from a pestilence. Northern capital and Northern brains and genius and enterprise will forsake you as if pursued by the demon of destruction.

Sir, with protection guarantied, the States of Virginia, and Georgia, and Tennessee, and Alabama will increase in wealth and power and population at a ratio that will cause the bleak hills and rugged mountains of my native State to hide their diminished heads in shame. You have a soil and a climate such as we of the North may well envy. You have your virgin forests, your rich agricultural lands, and your vast deposits of mineral wealth, and all you want is energy and capital to develop them. With all these natural advantages in your favor you have retrograded in the past and allowed your less-favored sister States to far outstrip you in all that constitutes the true grandeur and greatness and wealth of trade and commerce.

You know that all this is true just as well as I do. The late terrible civil strife ought to have demonstrated to you the vital importance of diversified industries in the South, and the utter folly of depending upon New England or Old England for what you are so abundantly able to produce yourselves. To be truly great, every State, like every nation, ought to be truly independent. With factories, and furnaces, and rolling-mills, and machine-shops in the South twenty-odd years ago it would have been as utterly impossible for the North to have overcome you as it would be to-day for the world in arms to destroy this great Republic!

I implore you, therefore, to stand by the policy under which this great Republic has prospered beyond anything in the history of civilized governments.

Let us not be beguiled by the voice of the free-trade charmer, "charm she never so sweetly!" Let us remain true to the policy of the fathers of the Republic under and by reason of which we have grown so great, so wealthy, so powerful and strong! Blessed with every variety of soil and climate—nearly every State an empire within herself, capable of manufacturing within herself nearly everything, from a needle to an anchor, from a pleasure-yacht to the grandest iron-clads that ever defied the fury of old Neptune—why should we be in any way dependent upon any nation or all the nations of the world combined for anything?

Proud, lofty America! Standing alone in the matchless grandeur of her imperial power and greatness, with her matchless mechanics and artisans, her fair women and noble men, let the civilized world learn wisdom from our example in mechanism as well as in the science of true government! And let us be grand and free as a people from any dependence upon foreign workshops, foreign mechanics, and foreign artisans, as we are free and great in the principles of enlightened liberty! [Applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, named by compliment the "Mills bill," proposes a total reduction in our national revenue of $53,720,447, based on importations of 1887. The value of these importations was $79,879,108 on the free-list and $178,329,048 on the dutiable-list, or a total of $258,208,157. The bill also proposes an internal-revenue tax reduction of $24,455,607, which, added to the reduction of import duties, gives a total proposed reduction of $78,176,054.

A majority of the Ways and Means Committee of this House assume the sponsorship of the bill, namely, Mr. MILLS of Texas, Mr. MCMILLIN of Tennessee, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, Mr. TURNER of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BYNUM of Indiana—all Democrats. Six of them represent Southern and two of them Northern States. The minority members of the committee—Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWNE of Indiana, Mr. REED of Maine, Mr. MCKINLEY of Ohio, and Mr. BURROWS of Michigan—all Republicans and all representing Northern States—declare that when the measure was completed by the majority and presented to the full committee, the majority refused to enter into consideration of its provisions or to disclose any data upon which their action was based, and allowed no modification of the bill unless it was suggested by the majority. So the bill is distinctively a partisan measure—more exclusively partisan than any measure presented to any United States Congress.

The bill is also sectional in its character. It is framed in the interest of the South and Southwest as against the North and Northeast. In addition to its sectionalism, it raids the manufacturing sections of the country to divide booty with the purely agricultural. It is legalized communism in the form of national legislation.

And before I proceed further in my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to the professional make-up of our present Ways and Means Committee. In its membership are found eleven lawyers, one cotton planter, and one railroad manager. They are all gentlemen of more than ordinary legislative experience, of high political standing in their several States, and yet were the title of the committee changed from Ways and Means to Judiciary, it would seem natural and appropriate. I hope the eleven lawyers, the cotton-planter, and the railroad manager will not take it as a breach of good manners on my part nor an infraction of the courtesies of the House when I thus publicly call the attention of the farmers, the manufacturers, the product-distributers, the product-carriers, the mechanics, the laborers, and the bankers to the anomalous, or rather abnormal, make-up of a committee charged with the regulation of the nation's commercial, financial, industrial, and social economic interests. The great State of New York—the Empire State of the nation—with more than $650,000,000 of capital invested in manufacturing, with over $1,000,000,000 of product annually turned out of her mills and shops, and with 600,000 wage-earners within her borders, has no representative on this committee, Democrat or Republican; but the States of Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee and Georgia, which, as shown by the census of 1880, had only $98,776,985 of capital invested in manufacturing, and all together employing 81,426 hands, have each a representative on the committee. What a farce!

FREE-TRADE LEGISLATION.

Of course we all know the reason for this abnormal constitution of the Ways and Means Committee. Mind you, I am not condemning the practice of forming our committees with the benefiting of party politics in view; I am deprecating the fact that current political opinion can or should tolerate it. And I will not remain silent, as a New York Representative, when the interests of our great State are ignored in preparatory legislation, let the offending party be Democratic or Republican. Mind you I am making no direct criticism on the able Speaker of this House, who is popularly supposed to be "the author and finisher" of our committees. It has been my privilege to know, and in some cases intimately, every Speaker who has occupied that chair since the days of James L. Orr, and I am free to say here before Democratic and Republican Representatives, that no fairer or abler parliamentarian has presided over the deliberations of this body than Mr. JOHN G. CARLISLE. But this vital business question has passed beyond the impartial judgment of a Speaker; it has become a partisan question.

With a Democratic Executive in the Presidential chair and a Democratic majority in the House it is natural, when tariff legislation is uppermost in Congress, that our committees should be constituted in the interests of free trade. It is also natural that the South, where free-trade opinion rules almost supreme, should hold the majority of and control the action of our important committees, especially those of Ways and Means and the Merchant Marine, for the South demands free trade in British ships as well as British manufactures.

During all the years of chattel slavery within the old Union, when King Cotton sat upon the free-trade throne, the political battle against Northern civilization raged almost incessantly in these Halls; and when secession abortively attempted a confederacy of its own and ordained a written constitution, the eighth section of article 1 declared:

> The congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, etc., but no bounties shall be granted, etc., nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Can it fairly be presumed that the lapse of twenty-five years, however advantaged for a change of policies or principles, would mark the dissolution or subversion of free-trade conceptions and prejudices imprinted on the Southern mind by iteration through a century? As the dominant power in the party, the Southern free-trader vaults into the saddle, and the Northern Democrat submissively goes afoot.

WHO PAYS THE TAX?

As general debate on this question is very near its close, and the House has been supplied with matter and argument approaching surfeit, I will content myself with some observations on a few features of the labor and wages questions as they are now or may be affected by tariff revision on the free-trade plan.

A Democratic speech on the tariff would be an inane partisan effort if it did not saddle the consumer with the tariff tax on the imported article he buys, or, by severer logic, prove that even the home-produced article is enhanced in price by the addition of the duty. The cue for Democratic effort in this line may be found in the following paragraph in President Cleveland's late message:

> Our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty.

Now, I grant this is a conceivable theory, and it has been adopted generally by the tariff orators on the other side of the House, who are always loyal followers of a leader, if not logical reasoners.

Sixty years ago, when our industries were weak and undiversified, there was considerable reason for the President's assumption; thirty years ago there was less reason; and now there is hardly any. The ordinary object of protection is not to give any such enhancement of the profit of any particular production over the average rate, but merely

to sustain it during the temporary stage of its domestication. Great Britain owes her industrial greatness to her adherence to this policy, for five centuries ago she was little more than an agricultural nation, dependent on continental manufactures for even the clothing worn by her subjects, although they raised the "raw material" at home. And she accomplished her industrial supremacy, not by higgling over 40 per cent., 80 per cent., or 100 per cent. imposts, but by doubling or trebling duties; and when that would not yield the desired protection she enacted prohibitory and penal laws for the protection of her growing industries.

As bearing directly on the question of duties for revenue and duties for protection, I quote the following paragraph from Professor Robert Ellis Thompson's standard work on Political Economy:

Protective duties yield for a considerable period a large revenue to the State, but that is not the object of their imposition. Duties for revenue—*i. e.*, too low to be protective—in spite of their appearance of moderation are highly unjust. They inflict all the hardships of indirect and unequal taxation without even the purpose of benefiting the consumer. Duties for protection, while they bring large revenues, have another purpose, and benefit the consumer to a far greater extent than they tax him, while their amount is equally available for public uses. Their object is their own abolition, for they aim at such a development of the national industry as shall render impossible the importation of the dutiable articles. To impose revenue duties is to accept indirect taxation as a permanent method of finance; to impose protective duties is not.

But let us return to the question. Who pays the tax or duty? Well, that depends upon, first, the quality, price, and supply of the home product against which the imported product must compete, and, second, upon the trade relations existing between the consignor and consignee. Then, possibly, no one in fact pays the duty as a tax, for a careful examination of the interesting report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the revision of the tariff (February 16, 1886) demonstrates the fact that foreign manufacturers often invoice their products for this market through special agencies at a much greater discount from price-lists than those allowed in their home markets, therefore placing their goods here, upon which duty is paid, far below the market value there.

Setting aside the troublesome question of undervaluations, let me present the views of an impartial gentleman (impartial at least as regards the policy dividing Democrats and Republicans), Mr. H. J. Pettifer, secretary of the Workman's Association for Defense of British Industry. Discussing lately this very question, he says:

Take the case of a manufacturer who is trying to compete in a country in which industry is defended with an article also produced in that country. Suppose, for instance, the Americans can produce a certain article for 1 shilling, while we in England can produce and deliver it for 10 pence, we could, if we had free trade with America, undersell them in their own market by 2 pence; but the American is not so foolish as to allow us to do this, so he puts 50 per cent. duty on the article. Now, 50 per cent. on 10 pence is 5 pence, which brings the English article up to 1 shilling, 3 pence, and as it would be absurd for us to offer it for 1 shilling 3 pence when the American can make and sell it for 1 shilling, what we have to do, if we are to sell it in that country at all, is to reduce profits and cut down wages and deliver it at 8 pence, when the 50 per cent. brings it up to the American level. But who has paid the duty? Why, certainly we lose 2 pence, and the American buyer loses 2 pence, but the American Treasury gets the whole of the 4 pence duty toward paying the taxation of the country.

But look at it from another point of view. Suppose we, in England, getting fair profits and paying fair wages, can turn out an article for 1 shilling, and the Germans can deliver it here for 10 pence, what do we do then? Do "we" level up? Certainly not; we level down; we have to reduce profits and cut down wages, in this case just as we did in the other, until we can produce at the German price, without making the German pay the slightest amount toward the taxation of this country, in which he has a free and open market. Is it not time we asked ourselves the question: Which system is best for the workingman, the American, which keeps wages up, or the English, which brings wages down?

Another illustration, one at President Cleveland's old home. Suppose wheat is selling in the Buffalo market at $1 a bushel. The tariff for the protection of the American farmer is 20 cents a bushel. An Erie County farmer drives into town, sells his wheat, and pockets his dollar. A Canadian farmer crosses the Niagara River, pays 20 cents duty, sells his wheat, and pockets 80 cents. Who pays the duty? Ask the Canadian.

But, high duty or low duty, do not let us quarrel over non-essentials. As long as we make foreigners pay a large share of our governmental expenses, and our sixty millions of people do not care enough about the matter to go to the trouble of signing a respectably-sized petition, or even hold a neighborhood mass-meeting in the way of caution or protest against the present method and purpose of collecting impost revenue, we are safe in lowering taxation and shutting off the accumulation of surplus revenue in some other manner, and I hope that is the way all this tariff discussion and legislation will end. Leastwise, if through partisan prejudice and pressure we can not or do not settle this question of fair, patriotic, and business-like principles while we have the opportunity, the people will determine it for us and themselves at the polls within a few months. [Applause.]

STEAM-POWER AND LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY.

I have searched in vain through all the speeches delivered in this House during the past fortnight for some solution of the wages problem involved in the present question. The regular readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been lately furnished by industrious wielders of the paste-pot and scissors with "tabulated statements" sufficient in diversity and quantity to keep the mathematically inclined busy until election time. These tables prove little or nothing; for any expert journalist knows that percentages can be juggled to prove either side of an argument, and notably in this line of falsification are the tariff arithmetical wonders performed by that free-trade propagandist who signs himself "A Parsee Merchant;" he takes the sweepstakes.

Before giving an opinion upon the probable effect a lowering of the tariff may have upon work and wages I wish to call the attention of the House to some forces and tendencies which have within the past eighty years wrought revolution in the labor world.

Since the time of the adoption of our national Constitution the civilized nations of the earth have successively passed through sudden transitions in their industrial economy, chiefly on account of changes from hand to steam power, and, adding to the power of steam, the invention and use of labor-saving machinery.

During that period or since, James Watt devised the condensing steam-engine; Hargreaves, the spinning-jenny; Arkwright, the spinning-frame and the factory system; Crompton, the mule-jenny; Cartwright, the power-loom; Whitney, the cotton-gin; Fitch, the steam-ship; Oliver Evans, the high-pressure engine; Stephenson, the locomotive; Morse, the telegraph; Howe, the sewing-machine; Bell, the telephone; Hoe, Bullock, and Scott, the lightning printing-presses; in short, the whole century has been agitated and crowded by inventions in the whole field of applied mechanics and science. And during all this time the workingman, skilled or unskilled, has been forced to adapt himself to unexpected and rapidly-changed conditions. Especially within the past fifty years the conflicts between muscle and brains, the man and the machine, capital and labor, the employer and employé, have been waged unceasingly in Great Britain, continental Europe, and America, and, I am sorry to say, the beginning of the end is not visible.

Allow me to direct your attention to Commissioner Carroll D. Wright's first annual report (1886), and especially to the chapter on "Machinery and overproduction." There you will find the controlling cause of strikes, lockouts, and labor disorganization. Think of the hundreds of thousands of American workmen who have been forced to adjust themselves to the changes, generally disadvantageous, wrought by labor-saving machinery and its powerful ally, steam. In the school-book of our fathers it was said that "it takes ten men to make a pin." Now we have a machine that only needs to be fed with wire, oiled and supplied with steam-power, to turn out complete pins, sort them, and even thrust them into the papers in the right numbers and in straight rows. What has become of the ten pin-makers? One probably runs the new machine, and the other nine swell the ranks of unemployed labor, ultimately dropping into the unskilled class below them.

Out of the many illustrations relative to the displacement of labor furnished by Commissioner Wright, I have time only to select a few. In the manufacture of agricultural implements new machinery during the past fifteen or twenty years has displaced fully 50 per cent. of the muscular labor formerly employed. In one establishment cited 600 employés are doing the work which under former conditions would have required 2,145 employés, a displacement of 1,545. In brick-making, improved devices displace 10 per cent. of the labor, and in manufacturing fire-brick 40 per cent. has been displaced. In the manufacture of boots and shoes, the Commissioner gives some very astonishing results. He says:

In one large and long-established manufactory in one of the Eastern States the proprietors testify that it would require five hundred persons working by hand processes to make as many women's boots and shoes as one hundred persons now make with the aid of machinery—a displacement of 80 per cent. In another class of the same industry the number of men required to produce a given quantity of boots and shoes has been reduced one-half. In another locality, and on another quality of boots, being entirely for women's wear, where formerly a first-class workman could turn out six pairs in one week he will now turn out eighteen pairs.

A well-known firm, engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes in the West states that in the grade of goods manufactured by it, it would take 120 persons working by hand to produce the amount of work done in its factory by 60 employés, and the hand-work would not compare in workmanship and appearance, as expressed by the concern, by 50 per cent. Goodyear's sewing-machine for turned shoes, with 1 man, will sew 250 pairs in one day. It would require 8 men working by hand to sew the same number. By the use of King's heel-shaver or trimmer 1 man will trim 300 pairs of shoes a day, where it formerly took 3 men to do the same.

One man, with the McKay machine, can handle 300 pairs of shoes per day, while, without the machine, he could handle but 5 pairs in the same time. In nailing on heels, by the use of machinery, 1 man and a boy can heel 300 pairs of shoes per day. It would require 5 men to do this by hand. In finishing the bottoms of shoes, 1 man with a sand-papering machine can handle 300 pairs, while it would require 4 men to do the same by hand. A large Philadelphia firm, engaged in the manufacture of boys' and children's shoes, states—and the foreman of the establishment corroborates the evidence—that the introduction of new machinery within the past thirty years has displaced about six times the amount of hand labor required, and that the cost of the product has been reduced one-half. On another grade of goods, manufactured in Maine, the facts collected by the agents of the bureau show that 1 man can now do the work which twenty years ago required 10 men.

In the manufacture of carpets the improvement in machinery in the past thirty years, taking weaving, spinning, and all the processes together, have displaced from ten to twenty times the number of persons now necessary.

In the manufacture of clothing, a cutting-machine will do six times the amount of work formerly done by one man in the old way. In the manufacture of soft and stiff hats there has been a displacement in the proportion of 9 to 1.

In the olden time, in the cotton-goods industry, an adult hand-loom weaver wove from 42 to 48 yards of common shirting per week. A

weaver tending six power-looms in a cotton factory of to-day would produce 1,500 yards a week.

In the manufacture of furniture, from one-half to three-fourths only of the old number of persons is now required.

In the lumber business 12 co-laborers with a Bucker machine will dress 12,000 staves; the same number of men by hand process would dress but 2,500. One boy running a planing-machine in turning woodwork for musical instruments and materials does the work of 25 men.

In manufactures of railroad supplies, rubber boots and shoes, silk, and soap the displacement is 50 per cent. in each.

But there is another factor in the displacement of hand and muscular processes, partially taken into account in the above statistics, which trebles man's productive force. It is stated by the bureau of statistics in Berlin that four-fifths of the engines now working in the world have been constructed during the past twenty-five years. The force equivalent to the working steam-engines represents—in the United States, 7,500,000 horse-power; in England, 7,000,000 horse-power; in Germany, 4,500,000 horse-power; in France, 3,000,000, and in Austria, 1,500,000. Add the horse-power represented by locomotives, 3,000,000, and the total is 46,000,000 horse-power. A steam horse-power is equal to three actual horses' power, and a living horse is equal to seven men. The steam-engines of the world represent, therefore, the work of 1,000,000,000 men.

Recent calculations by Hon. Edward Appleton, of Massachusetts, place the number of locomotives in the United States at 28,600. Commissioner Wright thus summarizes Mr. Appleton's data:

To do the work of these locomotives upon the existing common roads of the country and the equivalent of that which has been done upon the railroads the past year (1885) would require, in round numbers, 54,000,000 horses and 13,500,000 men. The work is now done, so far as men are concerned, by 250,000. The present cost of operating the railroads of the country with steam power is, in round numbers, $502,600,000 per annum; but to carry on the same amount of work with men and horses would cost the country $11,308,500,000.

REFORM THE REFORMERS.

Now, gentlemen, many of you are ready to ask, what connection has this wonderful array of statistical information to do with the tariff or the Mills bill? Well, frankly, I know of no better way to enlist the regard of the Ways and Means Committee or arouse the attention of this House to the amount of our machinery power and the magnitude of our industries, or to the vicious partisan policy which has projected a crude measure, in my opinion, into a Congress imperfectly prepared to fairly consider it. My best judgment is against dragging tariff revision into politics. Our capitalists, manufacturers, and bread-winners in general are of all shades of political opinion, and why half the industrial interests of the country should be brought into a game of battledoor and shuttlecock by politicians who have nothing at stake except transient honors and temporary spoils, must seem to every right-thinking citizen a blundering and vicious proceeding. An enactment covering not over four pages of bill-paper could dispose of the present surplus and provide a just measure of revenue for the future.

Our manufacturers and workingmen will not be deceived by the free-trade cries of "monopolies," "trusts," "cotton lords," "robber barons," and so forth. Three hundred and twenty-five men in any given industry know more about just wage rates, hours of labor, profits of their employers, and justice between man and man, than the three hundred and twenty-five Congressmen here assembled give them credit for.

REGULATION OF WAGES.

How are wages in the trades in this country established and regulated? Are wage schedules mere matters of chance or caprice? Do the "robber barons" or "monopolists" pay such rates as they please? Go into any trades union, Knights of Labor assembly, labor union, or workingmen's association and you will get the correct answer. In these halls of organized labor rates of wages and rules governing trades are proposed, discussed, passed upon, promulgated, and sustained. They are the workingmen's legislatures, where wage, social, arbitrative, and economic questions are settled. What an immense industrial army the united ranks of the Unionists and Knights aggregate, over one million by actual count; and not a member of the Cobden Club, honorary or active, carried on their muster-rolls. [Applause.]

It is safe to assert that these two great bodies of organized labor regulate and uphold directly one-third of the wage scales paid in this country and Canada. Indirectly, but surely, the other two-thirds feel and acknowledge this supreme power in wage regulation, craft discipline, and industrial well-being. It is only during the abnormal period of a "strike" that the attention of the general public is called to these great organizations of skilled and unskilled labor, yet every day in the year witnesses and records the assembling and legislative action of thousands upon thousands of these unions and assemblies. In the very nature of things these men associate for the protection of American labor, and in this connection I would direct the attention of members on both sides of this House to the remarks made by Mr. FORAN, of Ohio, a week ago.

Mr. FORAN and myself are generally far apart on political questions, but on the labor problem, on the wages question, and especially in our views on the Mills bill, we agree. Why? Because as representatives of organized skilled labor we see disorganization of and disaster to the well-being of the wage-earners in the possible passage of an act which subordinates every interest of the workingman to the attainment of cheap products through cheapened labor. The bill strikes at the producer, whether capitalist or workingman. By its ramshackle provisions, lawyers, doctors, *commissionaires, doctrinaires,* office-holders, speculators, coupon-clippers, middlemen, and the whole army of do-nothings—people who create nothing and try to control everything—are to be benefited at the expense of the American toilers who earn their living by exertion of brain or muscle, or both. The 5,000,000 workers of America are to be pitted against the 30,000,000 workers of Europe.

The free-list, which has steadily grown of late years, is to be further enlarged. In 1870 it aggregated one-ninth of the dutiable list; to-day it is about one-half; so that one-third of all imported goods now come in free of duty. All this talk about the "international comity of trade" and "the fixed economic principles which regulate trade and commerce between nations" has no interest to the American workingman. The truth is, he believes that the $240,000,000 worth of foreign goods which annually come into this market from abroad ought to be made here. He reasons the whole question of "the surplus" and "protection" in this way: If the locking up of $100,000,000 of our currency in our national Treasury, collected (he may admit) in the shape of taxes, causes congestion, contraction, and premonitory symptoms of a national panic, what would be the condition of our country if the balance of trade to the same amount went against us for only four years of free trade, and in that time $400,000,000 of our gold left our shores, never to return, to swell the coffers of our commercial rivals? No arguments of Cobden Club parasites or free-trade professors drawing fixed incomes from college funds can argue the American workman into any policy which exports American wages. He believes in keeping the wage-earning power here; he wants the field of labor enlarged, not contracted, and to secure the enlargement of that field he advocates diversity of production and expansion of development.

I want to say just here that while it may be possible to pass this bill in whole or emasculated, as a party measure, there are revising committees in all labor assemblies which will pass upon its merits independent of politics; and these great bodies of intelligent wage-earners will stand like a wall of iron against the proposed free-list and the cutting of wages foreshadowed in the impaired duties named in the dutiable list. American workmen have battled too long and sacrificed too much in gaining the position they now hold, to now tamely submit to any partisan demand. During this and the last Congress their power has been felt in this hall; a power which has both persuaded and constrained legislation for a more equal distribution of privileges, and unmasked the wrongs committed by monopoly and stall-fed avarice. [Applause.]

But suppose we let some of these workingmen speak for themselves. On the 8th of the present month a workingmen's mass-meeting was held in the large hall of Cooper Union, New York City. Its officers—Michael Breslin, president, and Jesse G. Miller, secretary—have sent me the following official copy of the resolutions adopted at the meeting:

Whereas, the so-called Mills tariff bill, now under discussion in the House, of Representatives, by placing on the free-list many articles that come into competition with the products of American labor, and by sweeping reductions in the duties upon others, menaces the ruin of many of our industries, and would if enacted into a law, entail great loss of employment and widespread suffering, among working people; and

Whereas, the workingmen of this country have been contemptuously denied a hearing by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which framed the bill; and

Whereas, it is now apparent to every workingman that the prevailing agitation of the tariff question and the proposed reduction of duties are destroying confidence in business, reducing wages in some occupations and stopping altogether the wages in others;

Therefore, we, the workingmen of the city of New York, in mass meeting assembled, earnestly protesting against the passage of the Mills tariff bill and against any and all measures of a similar character which threaten the labor and industry of our country and propose to lower the American standard of wages, do hereby declare and proclaim the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we demand of the Representatives in Congress from this city that they not only vote against this most recent attack on the prosperity of American labor, but that they use their utmost endeavors to secure its defeat.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which puts raw material on the free-list when that so-called raw material is the product of American labor.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which would break down the barrier which defends American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, and aims to reduce our families to the foreign level of cheapness and poverty.

Resolved, That we demand that the internal-revenue war taxes be repealed, and that protection to American labor be maintained and made more effective.

Resolved, That we call upon our fellow-workingmen in all parts of the land to rise up and denounce the Mills tariff bill as a menace to our welfare and to our rights as citizens, which threatens to deprive us of the opportunities of education afforded by the American system of high wages, and we denounce as a fraud the free-trade argument that the cost of living in this country is increased in proportion to the rates of duty on imports, except as we choose and are able to live better here than our unfortunate rivals in foreign countries.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President and every member of Congress.

COMPETITION AND CHEAPNESS.

The chief end of the Democratic tariff argument is universal competition and cheap goods. Sir Edward Sullivan, an authority seldom quoted by Cobdenites, says that—

free trade means untaxed foreign competition; that foreign competition means competition in cheapness; competition in cheapness means competition in cheap labor; competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood; and competition in flesh and blood is slavery.

Facilis est descensus Averni.

I say again, it has cost the American workmen millions of dollars in wages and lost time to reach the vantage-ground which they now occupy. The capitalist and the wage-earner, the employer and the employé, after fierce years of struggle and misunderstanding, now generally respect and consult each other's interests. What benefits one benefits the other. Arbitration is supplanting strikes; co-operative production will succeed arbitration, as co-operation is the child of confidence. He is a mean workman who begrudges his employer fair remuneration for his capital, and he is a mean employer who does not pay a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; for good labor at good wages is cheaper than poor labor at poor wages. Professor Thompson says:

The lowest wages that you can get a man to live on will not get the best work out of him. Put a whole people on such wages, and keep them there, if you can, for two our three generations, and you will have crushed the energy, the spirit, the heart out of that people, and made them a very inferior and unprofitable class of workmen. On the other hand, wages that put heart and hope into a man, that make him feel that his personal efforts and his best work are needed to keep them at present rates, that offer him the prospect of becoming his own master by frugality, that enable him to educate his children to fill a place like his own intelligently, or perhaps to rise to a higher place, such wages are in the long run the best of investments.

The President and his party profess sympathy for and protection to the interests of labor. How that can be done by taking thirty or forty fairly established American industries from the dutiable list and consigning them to a free-list grave is more than I can comprehend. I believe—and my belief is shared by every intelligent workingman in this country—that the only safe policy for the protection and promotion of American labor is to compel every European manufacturer to pay into the Treasury of the United States the difference in wages he has saved by not paying his workmen as much as American workmen receive, before he is allowed to sell his goods in this country.

A tariff revised on such a principle would meet the views of every fair-minded citizen, would allay alarm, give stability to industry, satisfy the employer and employé, equalize the consumer's taxes, prevent destructive competition, encourage new industries, and keep this nation, as it is confessedly now, in the front rank of the nations of the earth in material progress and Christian civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. J. H. Walker, in an address delivered before the Massachusetts Club a short time ago, said:

In view of the difficulty of individual investigation and agreement, it is only fair that all disputants accept the rate of wages given in the United States or Massachusetts reports for the different countries. I have taken the highest rate for each country given by either report, and I find the following yearly earnings. A family of four persons average to furnish two wage-workers. The total possible earnings of a man and woman in each country, in eight occupations, are as follows:

Trades.	America.	England.	France.	Belgium.	Germany.
Carpenters:					
Man	$700.00	$383.00	$310.00	$203.50	$205.50
Woman	300.00	153.20	124.00	81.40	82.20
	1,000.00	536.20	434.00	284.90	287.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	784.00	330.20	228.00	78.90	81.70
Laborers (common):					
Man	450.00	235.00	188.50	150.00	155.50
Woman	300.00	94.00	75.40	60.00	62.20
	750.00	329.00	263.90	210.00	217.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	534.00	123.00	57.90	4.00	11.70
Blacksmiths:					
Man	650.00	368.50	290.00	269.00	200.00
Woman	300.00	147.40	116.20	107.60	80.00
	950.00	515.90	406.20	376.60	280.00
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	734.00	309.90	200.20	170.60	74.00
Locomotive engineers:					
Man	1,250.00	456.00	516.00	460.00	468.81
Woman	300.00	182.40	206.40	184.00	187.52
	1,550.00	638.40	722.40	644.00	656.33
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	1,334.00	432.40	516.40	438.00	450.33
Locomotive firemen:					
Man	750.00	255.00	342.00	317.50	321.35
Woman	300.00	102.00	136.80	127.00	128.54
	1,050.00	357.00	478.80	444.50	449.89
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	834.00	151.00	272.80	238.50	243.89
Tinsmiths:					
Man	$550.00	$325.00	$273.00	$220.00	$177.50
Woman	300.00	130.00	109.20	88.00	71.00
	850.00	455.00	382.20	308.00	248.50
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	634.00	249.00	176.20	102.00	42.50
Tanners:					
Man	450.00	350.00	347.00	258.00	210.50
Woman	300.00	140.00	138.80	103.20	84.20
	750.00	490.00	485.80	361.20	294.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	534.00	284.00	279.80	155.20	88.70
Weavers:					
Man	500.00	350.00	250.00	197.50	139.50
Woman	300.00	140.00	100.00	79.00	55.80
	800.00	490.00	350.00	276.50	195.30
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	584.00	284.00	144.00	70.50	Minus.

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the gentleman from New York may be allowed to proceed, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am very grateful for the request, but shall not occupy further time as other gentlemen desire to occupy the floor.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the platforms of the political organizations in this country adopted in their great national conventions, presumably at least, represent their sentiments and convictions on public affairs and the policies of the parties adopting them. The Democratic party has year after year adopted platforms in the various States, and every four years has adopted a national platform expressive of what it thinks would catch votes. In 1856, upon this all-engrossing and commanding issue of the tariff, the Democrati Ncational Convention resolved—

That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another; or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country.

Its platform of 1856 reaffirmed the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, which averred among other things in substance that the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes for the purpose of protecting the industries of the country did not exist; and the substance of that provision of those resolutions was incorporated into the Confederate constitution when it forbade the levying of taxes for the protection of American industries.

The platforms of 1860 of both the Douglas and the Breckinridge conventions were silent upon the subject of the tariff. The Douglas contingent of the Democratic party at that time had, I presume, no very pronounced ideas upon the subject, represented, perhaps, a variety of opinions upon the question of protection, and did not seek to embody them in any platform.

The Breckinridge contingent of the Democratic party at the same time had in view, beyond all doubt, the establishment of the Southern Confederacy; and its views of the policy that should obtain were expressed in the Confederate constitution in the way I have spoken of.

The Democratic platform of 1864 was also silent upon the subject of the tariff. In the convention of 1864 only the tail of the Democratic party was represented; the dog had not been admitted, and the delegates who had been chosen in the States that were represented in that convention saw fit to give no expression of opinion upon this subject.

The Democratic platform of 1868 favored incidental protection in this language:

A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue laws as will afford protection to domestic manufacturers, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

That platform was more nearly the assertion of the theory of protection than any other which the national conventions of the Democratic party have ever adopted. The Democratic platform of 1872 averred:

That there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade; and we remit the decision of the subject to the people, to their Congressional districts, and to the decision of Congress thereof, wholly free from executive interference and dictation.

It semed to be the leading idea of the Democratic party at that time that for an Executive to dictate the policy of the party was more than a violation of the amenities and courtesies of politics. It amounted perhaps to an infringement of the theory of our Government, that legislation upon this subject should originate in the House of Representatives. With the proposition embodied that the Congressional dis-

tricts should for themselves regulate the subject I am not disposed to quarrel.

The platform of 1876 demanded:

That all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

The Democratic party at that juncture of its history had gone back to its original view asserted in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798.

The Democratic platform of 1880 also favored the tariff for revenue only; but the Democratic platform of 1884, upon which Grover Cleveland was elected, straddled the subject. It declared:

We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and subject to the preceding limitations, which are, first, that taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government; second, that the reduction of taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with the foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will amply cover any increased cost in production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country; we demand that the Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered.

That is the platform upon which President Cleveland was elected.

President Cleveland in view of that declaration would have done well, it seems to me, if he had permitted the subject of tariff revision to have been managed exclusively and solely by the House of Representatives, which has really control of the subject. But instead of doing that, President Cleveland sent to the House of Representatives at the opening of this session of Congress a message upon the subject of tariff revision which is without a parallel in the history of the American Republic. No other President in any emergency of the country at any other time has sent to the House of Representatives a message so positively and clearly indicating a line of policy upon an economic question as has President Cleveland in this case.

Having done that, it is said that through the influence of the Administration exerted in various ways Democratic nominations in various Congressional districts of the country have been controlled by the Administration in the interest of free trade or in the interest of the President's policy as indicated in his message. The Administration has not only done that, but it is reported in the newspapers that Democrats of good standing and of influential position who have heretofore been looked upon as leaders of the party have been denied the benefit of patronage, have been denied access to the President in consultations, have been refused an opportunity of presenting their views and insisting upon them, and have been driven by every expedient at the command of the Administration from the ranks of the Democratic party. It is even asserted, with what truth I do not pretend to say, that public measures involving the public interest have been denied the Executive sanction because of the attitude of Representatives in Congress upon the subject of tariff legislation. And it has been shown that the Administration, by an approval of the most charming and beautiful character, has commended the attitude of a recalcitrant Pennsylvanian when he espoused the cause of the Mills bill upon the floor of the House of Representatives to the detriment of his State and the injury of the whole country. [Applause.]

Without parallel I have said is the action of the Administration on the question of tariff legislation in the House of Representatives. At no time in the history of the whole country has an administration or a President undertaken to influence so directly and so compulsorily the legislation of the House of Representatives as has been evinced and as is being daily evinced by this Administration upon this economic problem which the House is now considering.

Mr. REED. The next thing to it was in the case of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes; there was a similar effort at that time by a Democratic administration in behalf of the extension of slavery.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of this platform of 1884, which manifestly straddled the subject of protection, which was of such tenor and import that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] could go into the State of New York and the State of New Jersey and explain to the people of those States that protection was safe in the hands of the Democratic party; in view of the fact that representatives could go into the free-trade States of this country and represent that the platform of 1884 was in favor of a revision of the tariff and in favor of free trade, is it fair, is is fair play that a President elected on that platform should influence the House of Representatives with a view to the enforcement of his policy? Is it fair to the people of the country that the House of Representatives, elected on that platform, many of whose members appear to be subject to coercion, should enact tariff legislation looking toward free trade when that platform of 1884 was susceptible of a construction looking towards protection? My conclusion is that it is not right, that fair play requires that the voters of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, should have an opportunity of voting on this subject before any action is taken by the House of Representatives. That chance should be given to the voters of this country before we enact tariff legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, in view of the duplex Democratic declaration of 1884, in view of the explanation given it in New York and New Jersey by Mr. RANDALL and other Democrats, what shall be said of the appointment of a Ways and Means Committee, embracing six members from free-trade States, who absolutely represent almost nothing of the economic interests of this country as compared with the great Northern States? It is true there is a representative upon that committee from the State of Pennsylvania, and there is a member on that committee from the State of Indiana, but those gentlemen, distinguished as they are, are but the tail, and can be wagged *ad libitum* by the Democratic dog. I mean this in no disrespectful sense. I mean it simply in the sense of outvoting the representatives from the Northern States. The six representatives on the Ways and Means Committee from the Southern States and the two Democratic members of that committee from the Northern States formulated the Mills bill from beginning to end. The Republican members of the committee had nothing to do with it—they were not permitted to have anything to do with it. So the six Southern Democrats on that committee could do as they pleased, and there was nothing left for the two Northern Democrats to do but to fall into line, which they appear to have done, gracefully.

Why should these gentleman, forsooth, formulate and prepare a measure on the subject of tariff revision, which involves not only the prosperity of capital, but the employment of labor also? They are not business men. Tariff revision deals with a business problem. They are not interested in the objects sought by protection. Protection is specially solicitous about the welfare of labor. Now, judge these gentleman by what their States represent in this respect.

According to the census of 1880 the amount of wages paid in Arkansas was, in round numbers, $925,000; in Georgia, $5,266,000; in Kentucky, $11,670,000; in Tennessee, $5,254,000; in Texas, $3,343,000; and in West Virginia, $4,313,000; an aggregate of about $30,750,000. Now, in my own little county of Allegheny, represented by my colleague on my right [Mr. DALZELL] and myself, there were paid in wages that year $22,371,000. Thus the one county of Allegheny paid within eight millions as much wages as the entire amount paid by those States represented by a majority of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ADAMS. What is that aggregate?

Mr. BAYNE. Thirty million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars was the amount paid by all the six States represented by the Southern members of the Committee on Ways and Means who formulated the tariff bill under discussion.

Mr. ADAMS. My own county in Illinois paid $37,000,000 in 1880, and last year paid $74,000,000 in wages.

Mr. BAYNE. And the city of Philadelphia paid $64,000,000 in 1880, and the State of Pennsylvania $134,000,000, and the great city of New York, not represented on the committee at all, paid $198,000,000.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BAYNE. I have not the time. I have only a half hour. I will yield for a question if my time be extended.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I have no power to do that, but I should like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as it is in the aggregate so it is in detail with these States. Take the wool statistics.

Wool statistics.

States.	Number of spindles.	Foreign wool in condition, purchased.	Domestic wool purchased.	Scoured wool (not including waste or shoddy) purchased.
		Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Arkansas	1,360		189,000	174,000
Georgia	2,224		366,274	310,074
Kentucky	14,110		1,230,075	1,230,075
Tennessee	6,860		883,338	805,836
Texas	600		175,000	770,000
Total	25,154		2,843,687	
Vermont	46,264	161,404	3,441,787	1,719,580
Rhode Island	160,524	2,198,726	17,151,957	9,520,553
Massachusetts	461,776	7,391,993	48,748,041	28,034,931

This table shows that the little State of Vermont has more spindles and purchased more wool than all the States represented by the gentlemen who controlled the formulation of this bill. The little State of Rhode Island, with but two Representatives in the House, exceeded all those States fivefold, and the State of Massachusetts did fifteen times the amount of business.

Now, take the boot and shoe industry—I select that article to please my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL]. Here is a table which shows the number of establishments and the amount of wages paid in 1880:

TABLE B.

States.	Number of establishments.	Wages paid in year.
Arkansas		
Georgia	4	$11,445
Kentucky	15	159,587
Tennessee	3	9,905
Texas		
West Virginia	1	3,500
Total	22	185,437
Massachusetts	982	24,875,106

And by this it is shown that the six States honored with representatives on the Committee of Ways and Means had but 22 establishments, and paid in wages but $185,437, while the State of Massachusetts had 982 establishments and paid nearly $25,000,000 in wages.

Here is a table with reference to iron and steel:

Iron and steel.

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid in year.
Arkansas		
Georgia	14	$185,489
Kentucky	29	1,344,400
Tennessee	43	659,773
Texas	1	27,720
West Virginia	29	1,541,816
Total	116	3,759,198
Pennsylvania	366	25,095,850
New York	89	4,099,451

Now, here is a table which makes a like exhibit and tells a like story. Take leather, tanned, and this is what is shown:

TABLE D.—*Leather, tanned.*

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid.
Arkansas	4	$942
Georgia	79	18,040
Kentucky	46	33,263
Tennessee	113	27,700
Texas	21	3,924
West Virginia	93	99,338
Total	336	184,207
California	63	132,629
New Jersey	56	762,697

I have tried hard to find out something that they do down there, something they manufacture. I have looked over the long list with that object in view, and I have found that they do some leather tanning. They have 356 leather-tanning establishments, and they paid in wages $184,207. California, having but 63 establishments, paid out $132,000; and New Jersey, with but 56, paid over $762,000 a year in wages. It required but $319 to run an establishment in the States that have a majority of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, while in New Jersey and California it required over $7,000. No wonder they have no strikes down there. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mixed textiles make a like showing:

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid.
Arkansas		
Georgia		
Kentucky	5	$135,948
Tennessee	1	7,500
Texas		
West Virginia		
Total	6	143,448
Connecticut	43	988,848
Pennsylvania	126	11,536,818

Now, an examination of this table shows that the little State of Connecticut paid nearly a million dollars in wages, while all the States of the Ways and Means Committee south of Mason and Dixon's line paid but $143,000, and the great State of Pennsylvania paid eleven and a half millions.

Next I have selected the glass establishments, and I have taken the number of establishments and the capital employed, and the total wages paid as shown by the census of 1880. Here is the exhibit:

States.	Number of glass establishments.	Capital.	Total wages paid in year.
Arkansas			
Georgia			
Kentucky	5	$795,000	$150,322
Tennessee			
Texas			
West Virginia	1		700
Total	6	795,000	151,022
New Jersey	27	2,728,021	1,300,038
Pennsylvania	78	7,639,706	3,897,306

All the States of the South having representatives on the Ways and Means Committee had but 6 establishments, with a total capital of $725,000, and they paid but $151,000 in wages, while New Jersey had 27 establishments and Pennsylvania 78, and the gentlemen who represent States largely devoid of this industry undertake to legislate upon it, as if they were quite capable of understanding the subject, and with a confidence which few men would dare to arrogate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why should a committee representing no more business enterprise than that, knowing no more about the economic problem which is presented by this bill than these figures imply—why should such a committee undertake to formulate legislation for the control of the business interests of this country? This is a business matter and business men should look into it and manage it. But, sir, I aver, and I challenge contradiction, that while we of the North are in favor of high wages to workingmen, you of the South are in favor of low wages. You want to keep wages down. I aver that you want to keep them down and that you mean to keep them down, and I know the reason you want to keep wages down. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] was honest enough to admit it the other day. You want to keep wages low because the few own the property in the Southern States, and if you raise wages you will put the wage-workers in competition with the few. Those wage-workers will gradually pick up little bodies of land and take to growing cotton and sugar and other things in competition with you, and I aver that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means want low wages, and do not want any legislation that will maintain or raise the wages of the workingmen of this country.

Mr. HOOKER. I say to the gentleman that the negroes of the South, in my region at least, are the best paid laborers in this country or anywhere else.

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes; they get $8 a month.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. No; they do not get $8 on an average.

Mr. BLAND (to Mr. BAYNE). How about your coal region in Pennsylvania and the Carnegie works, and your fights and your strikes?

Mr. BAYNE. I have given the reason why they have no strikes down South. It is because they have nobody to strike and nothing to strike for. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I endeavored to show in the first place by the declaration of the Democratic party in its national conventions, and by the course pursued by that party in States like New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania that it was not fair to revise the tariff at this session of Congress, because the issue had not been fairly and squarely made in the campaign of 1884, or since that time; and my next endeavor has been to show that the gentlemen from the six Southern States on the Ways and Means Committee have the power to control their two Democratic associates from the Northern States, and that those gentlemen are wholly unfit to revise the tariff in a business-like way and according to practical business principles, because they are utterly lacking in that business knowledge which is requisite to such an undertaking.

While I have thus, however, endeavored to show that the consideration of the question should be postponed until a Congress shall have been elected upon the square issue presented by the President's message, there is no sort of doubt that the Democratic majority will persist in its endeavor to foist upon the country the product of its theoretical knowledge of economical questions, because that party has always placed its dependence upon theories rather then upon facts, and looks with more favor upon the *à priori* method of reaching conclusions than it does upon the practical course of deriving conclusions from actual experience.

The Democratic party in the past, whenever it came into power, has reduced tariff duties. During the ninety-nine years of our national existence under the present Constitution there have been over one hundred

and thirty-five acts of Congress relating to tariff. The history of the country presents periods of alternation between protection and tarift for revenue. Every period of tariff for revenue was the result of Democratic ascendancy, and every period of protection was the result of the success of the Whig or Republican party. During the progress of this great debate—a debate I believe to be unequaled in the history of the country for learning, versatility, and the citation of facts—during the progress, I say, of this debate, one great and important feature of the system of protection has not been elaborated anything like as fully as its importance would seem to require. I refer to the effect which tarift legislation would have upon our financial system.

The student of our history and the clerk capable of single-entry bookkeeping will alike come to the conclusion that our financial system depends largely upon practical protection. The student of history will ascertain by an examination of our past that in every period of low tariff the precious metals were drained out of the country. The precious metals were sent abroad to purchase the products of foreign countries. The panic of 1837 and the panic of 1857 occurred after and in consequence of the tariff of 1833 and after and in consequence of the tariff of 1846. The gold and silver had been drained out of the country. The banks were unable to redeem their paper. By many persons who have not thought upon the subject the conclusion is arrived at that bad management was solely responsible for that. The truth is, that in nearly all cases it was the interest of the State banks to preserve their integrity and their solvency and to redeem their paper and to maintain themselves as respectable, solvent institutions.

The men who were interested in those banks had put their money in them; they had the pride of success, and the misfortunes of the banks meant losses to them, but they could not help it. The misfortunes to the banks were the results of national legislation which caused the precious metals to go abroad, and which thus disabled the banks so that they could not redeem their paper. Up to 1860 the United States mints had coined over six hundred millions of dollars of gold, and yet at that time there was but about one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty millions of gold in the United States. Four hundred and fifty million dollars of this sum and all the gold we had obtained in the years preceding that time had gone abroad. Now, the presence of gold and silver coin, and the paper of the banks and of the Government redeeming paper currency with gold and silver coin, make the paper currency of the country equally as good as coin. We have now a paper currency which is just as good as gold. It is just as good as gold, because it can be converted into gold at any moment of time.

Now, I want you to think for a moment about what the tariff of 1861 has done in this behalf. The balance of trade in all the history of the country before 1861 was against us, excepting an occasional year now and then, but the high tariff of 1861, notwithstanding the great war, notwithstanding the fact that we purchased largely from abroad, and notwithstanding the fact that we borrowed great sums of money from foreign countries, enabled us to redeem all our bonds held abroad, to pay for products which were purchased abroad, and so early as 1868 or 1870 the balance of trade began to turn in our favor, and from that time on each succeeding year brought gold and silver into our country from foreign countries to pay for what we sold to foreign countries in excess of what we bought from them, and to such an extent has this trade been in our favor that the vast aggregate is not less now than one thousand four hundred millions of dollars.

Now, anybody who would theorize about this would conclude that we ought to have in the United States a large quantity of gold and silver; and what is the fact? Why the fact is we have an immense quantity of gold and silver—a greater quantity than we have ever had at any former period of our history. It is estimated that there is now in the United States between eight and nine hundred millions of dollars of gold bullion and gold coin, and we have over three hundred millions, including fractional currency, of silver coin. There are more than two coined dollars back of every paper dollar, and every paper dollar is consequently as good as a coined dollar. It was the Republican policy of protection that brought about this condition of things.

Now, suppose you supplant the Republican policy of protection with the Democratic plan. What is the result going to be? Simply a vast increase of imports without a corresponding increase of exports. Our exports are absolutely regulated by the law of supply and demand. We cannot sell one bushel more of wheat in London under a free-trade policy than we can sell under the protection policy.

It has been asserted over and over again in this debate that the value of wheat is fixed by the quantity offered at Mark Lane. That proposition ignores the important factor of home consumption as if Mark Lane came over here and fixed our price, while in truth the price fixed here is owing to the home supply and the home demand, and that those two regulate the quantity which we offer in Europe. Now, while it is true that Mark Lane fixes the value of wheat over there, wheat is made neither higher nor lower by protection or free trade supposing the present conditions to continue. But if the policy of free trade shall obtain the value of wheat and of all other farm products is likely to become much less both in this country and in Europe, and for this simple reason: If the operatives and capital now engaged in manufacturing interests should be driven to other employments many of them would turn their attention to agriculture, and while the number of home consumers would not be increased, the number of producers would be augmented.

Now, how any sensible people having such resources as we have in this country, having such a home market as ours is, and having the power by reason of our great resources to make the United States the gold treasury of the world—why any sensible people should abandon a policy which secured beyond all doubt these great advantages to us, is a mystery to me, and it seems to me it should be a mystery to every patriotic citizen of the country. It is without justification or excuse. It is a bad time to make the change, for in the calendar year of 1887 our domestic exports were about $703,000,000, while our imports were $708,000,000, and for the first time in fifteen or sixteen years has the balance of trade turned against us. If the Mills bill should become a law the balance of trade would become still greater and greater against us. History would repeat itself. The Democratic policy, which has always heretofore driven from the country our precious metals and drawn into the country the products of foreign countries, would drive our vast accumulation of precious metals abroad and would draw in the products of foreign manufacturers.

When our gold and silver should have gone abroad and our paper should not be convertible into coin, and commercial credits should be brought to the test which the absence of good money always brings about, we should have a repetition of the experience of 1837 and of 1857. That is the outlook which the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, and the Democratic President of the United States invite. They do not invite it, perhaps, intentionally; they do it unwittingly. Some do it, perhaps, through motives of jealousy; there may be real envy here and there. It is not difficult to discern that most of the Southern Democrats would just as leave buy what they want from Old England as from New England. On memorial occasions, or when an appropriation is wanted for some public exhibition at New Orleans or at some other point, sectional lines seem to be obliterated and the gush of fraternal regard seems to fill the lips and hearts of our Southern friends to overflowing. But when it comes to a practical test of friendship, when it comes to a question whether a few cents more shall be paid for the blanket manufactured in Iowa or in New England over the price demanded for such a blanket by Old England, then the gush subsides and the fraternal spirit takes a rest.

We want no tariff legislation at this session of Congress. When the tariff shall be revised we want it revised by its friends. The Republicans, however, are perfectly willing to reduce the revenue of the Government. They are willing to take the tax off domestic tobacco, which will reduce the revenue $30,000,000. They are willing to take the duties off raw sugar and to place a small duty on refined sugar, and to pay a bounty equivalent to the present rate of duty on the home production of sugar. They are willing to release from duty the spirits used in the arts and to discontinue special liquor licenses. There they want to stop. This simple proposition will reduce the revenue between $80,000,000 and $90,000,000, as much as and probably more than it should be reduced. The Republicans feel it to be their duty to remember the soldiers of the Republic, most of whom are now a good way past the meridian of life and many of them needing that assistance which the Government should not hesitate to freely give. It is therefore the aim of the Republican party to maintain a sufficient income by the Government to provide for such as these.

The cry of the President and the Democratic party as to the great danger resulting from the vast surplus in the Treasury is the invention of the politician, and not the outgiving of the statesman. The President knows that the national banks all over the country have deposits of money belonging to the Government, and he knows that the money thus deposited is being used for commercial purposes. The list of banks obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] shows that there are about three hundred of them having deposits. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury know it now if they did not know it before, that they have the power to purchase United States bonds with the money that comes into the Treasury, and it is obviously within their power to reduce the surplus by the purchase of bonds to whatever extent they may deem advisable. In the face of these two facts, the distribution of the money throughout the country to the national banks, and the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase Government bonds, to raise a hue and cry about the danger of the surplus interfering with the business of the country is sheer nonsense. The business of the country is threatened with infinitely greater disaster by the legislation proposed in the Mills bill, and next November, when the people of the country will have an opportunity of deciding whether the Republicans be right or the Democrats be right, if I am not greatly mistaken the verdict will be decisively in favor of the Republicans.

Mr. LAIRD was recognized.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, as I am to follow the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LAIRD], it may as well be understood now by the

Chair and by the House that I have agreed to yield him ten minutes of my time, to begin at the end of his own time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the financial condition of this country to-day is such as to alarm thinking men into reflection.

Speaking of this condition, the President of the United States, in his message of December 6, 1887, uses the following language:

You are confronted at the threshold of your legislative duties with a condition of the national finances which imperatively demands immediate and careful consideration.

This condition of our Treasury is not altogether new; and it has more than once of late been submitted to the people's representatives in the Congress, who alone can apply a remedy. And yet the situation still continues, with aggravated incidents, more than ever presaging financial convulsion and wide-spread disaster.

It will not do to neglect this situation because its dangers are not now palpably imminent and apparent. They exist none the less certainly, and await the unforeseen and unexpected occasion when suddenly they will be precipitated upon us.

Proceeding, he says that the accumulations by the 30th of June, 1888, will swell the surplus to $140,000,000. This is the condition as confessed to by this officer, and I accompany it by a statement made by a leading banking concern of New York, which shows that the amount of money now withdrawn from the circulation and at present available for the redemption of the debt of the United States is not, as stated by Mr. Cleveland, $140,000,000, but, on the contrary, reaches the enormous sum of $330,000,000. Here is the statement:

The following figures are from the official statement of James W. Hyatt, Treasurer United States, issued March 31, 1888: Gross amount of cash in his hands as Treasurer, $673,158,371.60; against which has been issued in gold, silver, and legal-tender-note certificates, $292,395,394; leaving net money in his hands as Treasurer, $380,762,977.60, out of which the Treasurer has $61,231,647.36 lying in the national banks, secured by deposit with him of Government bonds.

Of this vast sum now out of use, $100,000,000 is retained as a reserve against the legal-tender notes; $37,249,253.08 is retained to cover various appropriations; $99,192,622.15 is the actual net amount retained to cover redemptions of national-bank notes, leaving $130,326,758.54 as the actual surplus at that date. Of this amount $25,752,828.20 is fractional silver.

The spirit of all laws of Congress is that only $100,000,000 shall be kept idle, but from this statement we see $230,326,758.54 is kept idle, and with the nearly $100,000,000 also idle awaiting the slow process of redeeming national-bank notes, we have a grand total of idle money of upwards of $330,000,000, or sufficient to redeem on a 2 per cent. basis all the outstanding 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, and with the additional accumulation of surplus up to end of the fiscal year June 30, 1888—say $36,000,000—would then leave the $100,000,000 reserve against legal tenders intact and some $25,000,000 besides.

If the remedy for the "trouble" depends on "Congress" it should awake at once.

In the light of this statement of the business men, taken from the report of his Treasurer, Mr. Cleveland conceals the true situation by minifying the amount of available surplus $200,000,000. Not much of a difference to the Executive, perhaps, but a difference to the shrunken volume of currency, which weighs every hour of its continuance with untold peril.

In my judgment all that is here said by the Executive and by the bankers concerning the evil consequences of the sequestration of the enormous sums of money represented by the Treasury surplus is true, and more.

Nor are the evils of the situation hidden in the prospective; they are now "palpably imminent and apparent."

The demoralizing effect of the withdrawal and withholding of the money of the people from the great business enterprises recently entered upon or projected can be seen by any careful observer of affairs.

When all securities, stocks, and bonds, Government as well as others, are going down and interest is going up; when wheat and the great staples of the West, when iron and its manifold products are declining; when wages are falling and strikes are choking the great lines of transportation and threatening general revolt and the stoppage of internal carriage and the commerce dependent thereon, and others still have but recently released their hands from the vital supply of coal; when trusts are springing up on every side inspired to unholy activity by the example of the Government, and are on every side combining with evil fortune and hard times to further depress universal trade and defeat individual endeavor; while these trusts, the monsters of traffic, defying lawful methods, are with one hand crushing out contracts, and with the other sowing the seed of desperation that soon may ripen into anarchy, the President of the United States confronts the situation by saying in his message that there is no authority for the application of these funds to the purchase of bonds not now due, except that—

found in an appropriation bill passed a number of years ago, and it is subject to the suspicion that it was intended as temporary and limited in its application.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is the law referred to by the Executive as "subject to suspicion" and supposed to be "temporary:"

Act of March 3, 1881, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase United States bonds with his surplus money.

Be it enacted, etc.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds: *Provided*, That the bonds so purchased or redeemed shall constitute no part of the sinking fund, but shall be canceled.

Approved March 3, 1881.

It has stood upon the statute-books unchallenged until now, and under it subsequent administrations without question bought up and redeemed $182,241,750 of the bonds of the United States, and under which, as the only and sufficient authority, his own Secretary of the Treasury has already purchased not only the 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, but also the 4 per cents. due in 1907, paying for the former 108 cents on the dollar and for the latter 127 cents on the dollar, expending in the purchase of $18,088,000 of such bonds $21,665,500 of the surplus under this authority repudiated by the President.

Mr. Chairman, does not the President go to desperate lengths to relieve himself and his administration of the responsibilities of the situation when he says that because the law of 1881 is "subject to suspicion" he therefore refuses to proceed under it? What is this but repudiation of the laws? Who is "suspicious" of the law? Who has said it was temporary? Has the court said so? Has the Congress repealed it? And if not where does he obtain the power to set aside at will a law passed and approved four years before he came to power?

From whence does he obtain the authority to nullify the acts of Congress? We supposed we had a servant committed by his oath to the execution of the laws. We awake to find we have a master before whose imperial will the laws must bend or yield.

Thus far this Administration has furnished the country much food for reflection, but none so startling as this.

There was one of the subordinate officers of the Government who, intoxicated with power, undertook the suspension of the laws "upon suspicion," and this same President placidly broke his official neck, to the entire satisfaction of all well-wishers of good government. It is unnecessary, sir, to say that I refer to the late unlamented Mr. William Andrew Jackson Sparks.

Will His Excellency make his own significant commentary and restrain his exuberant impetuosity when he is tempted to use the imperial veto on laws he can only obey, or disobeying, take the consequences.

But, sir, supposing the President sincere in his reference to the law of 1881, how will he or his champions explain the fact that he refused his approval to exactly such a law as he says the situation now needs, and if now has always during his term of office needed?

The Forty-ninth Congress passed what is known as the "Morrison surplus resolution" July 30, and sent it on that day to the President. He did not return it, and Congress adjourned August 7, 1885, and the resolution was killed by the deliberate act of the man who now lays all the evils of the surplus to want of authority to buy bonds, which he is buying, or, in other words, to Congress.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the situation is so perilous and the demand for relief so imperative, why is it that the bill to provide for the purchase of bonds, which passed the House February 29, 1888, went to the Senate, was amended, returned to the House, and referred to the Committee on Finance March 1, and reported back to the House March 6, has not been called up, considered, and passed? Who is responsible for this?

Is it not the duty of the majority to save the industries of the country from death by financial inanition, to the end that they may try the effects of tariff reform on them, for the benefit of science, if nothing else?

Mr. Chairman, one of the objections of the President to the law of 1881, directing the application of the surplus to the purchase of undue bonds, is that it is found in an appropriation bill. This is not without a precedent other than that furnished by a Republican administration.

In Polk's message of December, 1847, he said:

It is recommended that as soon as the war shall be over (with Mexico), all the surplus in the Treasury not needed for other indispensable objects shall constitute a sinking fund, and be applied to the purchase of the funded debt, and that authority be conferred by law for that purpose.

In accordance therewith came the tardy act, section 9 of the appropriation bill of March 3, 1853, whereby the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized "to purchase at the current market rate any of the outstanding bonds of the United States that he may deem most advisable from any 'surplus' funds in the Treasury," but the surplus must not be reduced below six millions (Statutes at Large, volume 10, page 212).

Under this act of 1853 the Democratic administration paid as high as 21 per cent. premium for bonds due in twenty years. Here is the statement:

Statement showing when debt of United States was redeemable, rate of interest, and rate of premium paid.

Loan.	Rate of interest.	When redeemable.	Premium paid.				
			July 30 to Dec. 25, 1853.	Jan. 1 to Aug. 25, 1854.	Aug. 26, 1854, to Jan. 2, 1855.	Jan. 3, 1855, to Mar. 3, 1857.	Mar. 4 to Oct. 17, 1857.
	Per cent.		*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1842.....	6	Dec. 31, 1862	16	15½	11	10	10
1846.....	6	Nov. 12, 1856	8½	6	3	2½ to 1½	.....
1847.....	6	Jan. 1, 1868	21	21	16	16	16
1848.....	6	July 1, 1868	21	21	16	16	16
Texas indemnity.....	5	Jan. 1, 1865	.....	10	6	6	6

In from three to four years the Secretary of the Treasury, under the act of 1853, had paid in premiums over $4,600,000, and claimed he had saved in interest $14,600,000.

Mr. Chairman, before the hoarded treasures of the Government had reached their present dangerous sum the prosperity of the country west of the Missouri River was never greater. The amount of internal improvement during the years 1886–'87 was unparalleled, and yet to-day hundreds of miles of graded railroad line through Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota, and Wyoming lie tieless and unironed, waiting for the will and power of the great corporate owners and projectors to give the "touch of life" to their work and deliverance to the country they penetrate, which is now hopelessly cut off from the commercial world.

You ask the managers of great Western systems, which a year ago began work that was to end on the shores of the Pacific, why it is that they have suspended, and they will answer you it is because they can not profitably get the means with which to proceed, that they dare not take the risks, that capitalists and stockholders are stricken with a sudden dismay, and that they are halting between hope and fear until the millions in the Treasury are unlocked and the surplus ceases to menace the country with ruin.

The shadow of caution, distrust, and fear has fallen upon the business of the country, and the nation seems to have wakened suddenly to the fact that its very life-blood is congested; that its medium of exchange, its money, its gold, all that which circulating through the peaceful channels of business constitutes the calm health of nations, is being "pooled," "cornered," and "combined" in the "dead-lock" of the Treasury, from whence its influence issues like a malediction, paralyzing credit and capital into conservative inactivity.

In view of this condition of the country and its business, incident to the condition of the Treasury, it is truly time to call a halt, and not only ask but know what is the trouble and who is responsible for it; what is the remedy, and apply it.

The remedy and responsibility, sir, under existing laws, rest with the Secretary of the Treasury and the executive head of the Government, and if those responsible will at once undertake the purchase and redemption of the two hundred and thirty millions of 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, which can be bought at a premium of 8 per cent., and an annual saving of 2 or 2½ per cent. on the entire interest, then the burden which is weighing the country down will be lifted and the great work of development now standing at a halt can go forward.

The theory of the Democratic majority is that the tariff is at fault, and that all the evils of the times are to be laid upon it. I will not stop at this moment to discuss a theory which may remotely affect the situation. Whether the surplus sprang from the tariff or not, it is still true that in either event the Democratic party is responsible, for it alone had the power to lower the taxes and stop the accumulations. Whether good or evil, the surplus is a fact, and as such demanded the attention of the majority party and its Executive, and that attention they have stubbornly or ignorantly refused to give. And so I appeal from their theory to this fact: Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury should to-morrow call in the sixty-one millions of money of the Government loaned without interest to the national banks of the country, and they in turn should call on their customers who are carrying on vast undertakings based upon this credit, would not this contraction produce a crash that would involve the commercial world in ruin? This, I take it, would give us a result for which we would not be indebted to theory, and which would be so dire and complete that no man on this floor cares to invoke the test.

Mr. Chairman, the mismanagement of the surplus was not the first mistake of this political Moses. Has the country forgotten that the first act of Mr. Cleveland's Administration was to advertise in his annual message of 1885 for a panic? He asked the world to furnish him a panic to prove that his theory that silver was the enemy of gold and would drive the latter across the seas was true.

The President had borrowed this prediction from the financial prophets of the Administration in Wall street—from gentlemen who inherit their disinterested ability to shape the financial course of this nation in a direct line of transmission from the money-changers that Christ recommended should be scourged from the temple.

There was no panic. The prediction failed. The much-conjured devil of destruction was too decent to come forth. The loaded dice of the Administration, thrown in conspiracy with the proposed Wall-street gold corner, failed to produce the expected, if not the desired, result. Not fate and chance, but the laws of business, incapable of corruption or the influence of man, defended us.

Take it all in all, Mr. Chairman, the result of the financial policy of the Administration has not been happy upon the West. Whether that policy had its origin in ignorance, indifference, or mendacity, its culmination has produced results costing us millions in additional interest charges upon our loans, and renewals of the same; millions snatched, by the Government "corner" on the money, from the toil-stained hands of the farmers of the West, whose life is a patient struggle waged with unpretending courage against "a sea of troubles."

It was a cruel blow to a class of men numbering all told over 7,000,000, and including directly or indirectly one-third of the entire population of the United States. And they are a class that deserve well of the Republic. They are neither socialists, anarchists, nor grumblers. Under all the terrible temptations of impending ruin they are still the living promise of the country's peace, prosperity, and stability. They are as fundamental as the Andes or the Rockies, and constitute the backbone of both our system of business and of government. And so long as they can live I have no fear for the Republic.

Mr. Chairman, here is a verification of the disastrous effects of the surplus policy of this Administration on the farm products of this country—nor is its full loss to the country west of the Missouri computed here, nor can it be with any just degree of certainty, because of the additional loss to the far West on account of transportation.

Average export prices of certain commodities for the fiscal years from 1854 *to* 1861 *compared with* 1885, 1886, *and* 1887.

Years.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Cotton, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.
1854 to 1861	$0.75	$1.33	$0.10⅝	$0.17½	$0.09⅝
1885, 1886, 1887	.50 6/10	.87 3/10	.10	.16 1/10	.09
Difference	.24 4/10	.45 7/10	.00⅝	.01 4/10	.00⅝

Comparative yearly loss to American farmers on said crops between above periods.

On corn	$366,000,000
On wheat	205,580,000
On cotton	22,000,000
On dairy products	56,290,000
Total yearly loss	649,870,000

From the first table it appears that the total average yearly loss to agriculture during the years 1885, 1886, 1887, as compared with the years from 1854 to 1861, is $649,870,000, or a total loss for the three years of the monstrous sum of $1,949,610,000. And this loss is contemporaneous with the policy of "cornering" the money of the country in the United States Treasury commenced with his own administration, and now, by his own admission, about to culminate in ruin.

I omit, Mr. Chairman, any special reference to the tables comparing the years from 1860 to 1869 and from 1868 to 1878 with the three years of Mr. Cleveland's surplus policy for the obvious reason that the condition of values during that time was so unsettled that it might and would be said that the startling disclosures made by the figures were chargeable to that and not to the policy under consideration.

Average export prices for the fiscal years from 1876 *to* 1885, *compared with* 1885, 1886, *and* 1887.

	Corn per bushel.	Wheat per bushel.	Cotton per pound.	Butter per pound.	Cheese per pound.
1876 to 1885	$0.58¾	$1.16¾	$0.11	$0.18½	$0.10⅛
1885, 1886, 1887	.50 6/10	.87 3/10	.10	.16 1/10	.09
Decline	.07 21/40	.29 3/10	.01	.02 1/10	.01⅛

Comparative yearly loss to American farmers on said crops between above periods:

On corn	$112,500,000
On wheat	130,500,000
On cotton	27,000,000
On dairy products	98,000,000
Total yearly loss	468,000,000

The table showing the comparative loss to agriculture for the years 1885, 1886, and 1887, as contrasted with the period from 1876 to 1885, is not open to that objection, and the total yearly loss on corn, wheat, cotton, and dairy products for this period of $468,000,000 is not explainable otherwise than by reference to the condition of the currency. The aggregate for the three years, 1885, 1886, and 1887, of the comparative losses thus established is $1,404,000,000, from which I deduct the comparative loss on the cotton crop of the Southern planter, and find the net comparative loss on corn, wheat, and dairy products to have been $1,323,000,000, most of which fell upon the country west of the Mississippi.

It can not be answered that these results are chargeable to overproduction of wheat, for, as appears by the following table, the production of Europe in the three years next preceding, 1885, 1886, and 1887, was 69,000,000 bushels less than for those years.

[See table on next page.]

Wheat crops in this country, according to United States Agricultural Department reports.

Years.	Acres.	Bushels.	Average yearly price in Chicago.
1877	26,177,546	365,000,000	$1.25¾
1878	32,108,560	420,122,400	.96¾
1879	32,545,950	448,756,630	.99½
1880	37,986,717	498,549,868	1.05½

Wheat crops in this country, according to United States Agricultural Department reports.—Continued.

Years.	Acres.	Bushels.	Average yearly price in Chicago.
1881	37,709,020	380,280,090	$1.15½
1882	37,067,194	504,185,470	1.18
1883	36,455,593	421,086,160	1.01⅞
1884	39,474,885	512,763,900	.82¾
Total	279,526,465	3,560,744,518	
Average per year	34,940,808	443,843,064⅞	1.05⅝
1885	34,189,246	357,112,000	.83¾
1886	36,557,000	457,218,000	.76¾
1887	37,076,000	456,329,000	.75½
Total	107,822,246	1,270,659,080	
Average per year	35,940,748⅞	423,553,000	.78½

And a comparison of the wheat crop in this country for the three years of 1885, 1886, and 1887 with the three years previous shows an annual average decrease for 1885, 1886, and 1887 of 55,812,176 bushels, or a total decrease of this product for the three years of 167,436,528 bushels.

Leaving this branch of the subject, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the losses of the farmers of this country, aggregating millions per year, are chargeable to the reduction of the volume of the currency by the policy of the present Administration, a policy which, ignorantly or intelligently, makes the Government the principal factor in the combinations of capital which compel the producers to sell their products at such prices as renders the business of bread-raising a practical failure.

Mr. Chairman, the estimated expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year, June 30, 1888, to June 30, 1889, are placed at $325,000,000. Its incomes from all sources are placed at $383,000,000, derived as follows:

From sales of public lands	$10,000,000.00
From national banks	2,000,000.00
From interest and sinking fund, Pacific railways	2,000,000.00
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc	1,150,000.00
From fees consular, letters patent, and lands	3,500,000.00
From sales of public property	300,000.00
From profits on coinage, assays, etc	9,000,000.00
From deposits for surveying public lands	150,000.00
From revenues of the District of Columbia	2,400,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	4,500,000.00
Internal-revenue sources	120,000,000.00
Customs	228,000,000.00
Aggregating the sum of	383,000,000.00

Assuming, as we may, that the estimates will be cut at least $15,000,000, the gross amount appropriated for the conduct of the Government for the period named will stand at $310,000,000, which, deducted from the gross incomes, leaves $73,000,000 as the excess of the incomes over the expenses of the Government for the period named.

This, if the present surplus be not reduced by its application to the purchase of the $230,000,000 of 4½ per cent. bonds, would make the aggregate available cash in the Treasury June 30, 1889, according to Mr. Cleveland's estimate, $213,000,000, or, according to the calculation of the New York bankers, based on the Treasurer's statement for March 31, 1888, $403,000,000.

I see nothing but danger in the surplus, and therefore am opposed to its further accumulation and am in favor of attacking it at both ends. Pay the debts with what is already piled up, and stop the useless accumulation of more by a reduction of customs duties and internal taxes.

Something might be said of the necessity of a navy, but since I listened to the speech of my eloquent friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] in the Forty-eighth Congress on that subject, I have lost all hope. It will be remembered that that gentleman declared that all the navy we needed, in order to become the terror of the seas, could be built out of "two hemlock logs lashed together, and an American flag." And this sublime suggestion for the national defense met with the enthusiastic approval of his party.

Something might be said of the need of ordnance and defensive works for the protection of our 15,000 miles of undefended rivers, coasts, and harbors, and the cities that in the event of war would become the sport of destruction, and it has been said here by over-sanguine gentlemen, who did not think on whose bottom the Democratic tub was standing, and what was said here was long ago better said than here by the dead sage of Gramercy Park, but all in vain, for the ability of his party to appreciate a wisdom sounding in patriotism and progress is deader than the venerated dust of their forgotten idol.

Something might be said of the need of plants for the manufacture, and places for the assemblage of modern ordnance, to the end that when, under the operation of the policy of free trade, we are compelled to abandon the ancient and honored doctrine of non-intervention in the affairs of Europe, and to accept as one of the blessings of good government her intervention in the affairs of this continent, we might respond in kind, when England sends her fleet to levy for debt on the United States, with fire and iron, as she did on Egypt.

But I refrain, for I remember that in the course of debate on the question of the continuance of a patent in the Forty-ninth Congress it was held by the honored and progressive gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] that invention was a curse and progress a pitfall; that but for the untimely miracles of printing and gunpowder the land of Arkansas would still have been like the happy valley of the Abyssinian prince, and that the inhabitants thereof, instead of "listening with credulity to the whispers of fancy, following with eagerness the phantoms of hope," instead of "expecting that age would perform the promises of youth, and to-morrow would cure the deficiencies of to-day," would still be plowing the timber-strewn beaver clearing with a crooked stick, and shooting the succulent alligator with a club.

Since I learned these things, sir, and many more like them, from the gentleman in question, I abandoned the hope of appropriations for the benefit of that which is scientific in arms, and following the inevitable course of Democratic empire back across the conquered fields of science toward the dark ages, I agree that it will be bettter and cheaper, particularly cheaper, for you to put out the electric light, the undying spark of American genius, banish the electric spirit that speaks to us across continents and under oceans like the still small voice of Omniscience, break the great wheels that roll the billions of American commerce across a tideless continent and unite the eastern and western seas by the twin miracles of fire and iron, break up for us the great presses that print for us each day an intellectual picture of the world and "give its lettered pomp to tooth of time," and, folding our tents like the Arabs, quietly steal away, pausing, perhaps, in our backward march to ask why the monument at Bunker Hill and why the graves at Lexington.

Since I learned these things, sir, so eloquently inculcated by the advocate of that lofty proposition, that all that is is wrong, I have come to

Production of wheat in Europe from 1881 *to* 1888.

[In the absence of official figures, latest estimates are given.]

Countries.	1887.	1886.	1885.	1884.	1883.	1882.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
Austria	40,000,000	38,800,000	39,725,000	43,814,746	37,871,261	44,548,149
Hungary	114,000,000	110,500,000	114,638,868	107,208,499	90,515,616	133,481,263
Belgium	20,000,000	18,250,000	19,573,926	22,700,000	16,645,666	24,990,030
Denmark	5,000,000	4,800,000	5,000,000	4,969,739	4,682,130	4,554,284
France	303,000,000	275,000,000	312,912,137	324,130,397	294,400,346	346,610,624
Germany	108,000,000	80,000,000	106,973,750	91,082,424	86,379,000	93,823,048
Great Britain and Ireland	79,000,000	68,500,000	82,145,888	84,653,715	72,768,921	91,381,500
Greece	4,000,000	4,800,000	5,102,894	5,102,894	5,102,894	5,102,894
Italy	124,000,000	130,000,000	118,244,589	115,500,000	124,411,748	155,012,168
Netherlands	10,000,000	5,000,000	4,965,625	5,892,079	5,628,643	5,439,488
Portugal	8,000,000	7,500,000	7,561,250	7,093,780	8,512,500	7,200,000
Roumania	20,000,000	20,000,000	22,629,063	36,887,000	20,000,000	30,000,000
Russia	295,000,000	190,000,000	209,192,256	266,711,972	218,816,360	202,907,736
Servia	3,000,000	2,750,000	4,681,875	6,242,500	4,500,000	6,810,768
Spain	114,000,000	112,000,000	113,500,000	99,312,500	120,000,000	85,134,600
Sweden and Norway	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,837,500	3,822,857	3,107,394	3,792,884
Switzerland	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,057,188	2,128,125	2,128,125	2,128,125
Turkey	44,000,000	45,000,000	45,400,000	42,562,500	36,887,500	40,867,200
Other countries	1,000,000	500,000	567,500	567,500	567,500	567,500
Total	1,297,500,000	1,117,300,000	1,217,809,309	1,270,383,227	1,152,925,514	1,287,332,264

Aggregate:	*Bushels.*
1882, 1883, and 1884	3,709,000,000
1885, 1886, and 1887	3,631,000,000

believe that there was no way for us to prepare for the unhappy contingency of future war than to abandon the repeating rifle, abolish the Krupp gun, and arm our future champions in combat with a tough club adorned with alligator's teeth, and when defending the coast let them carry in addition a bag of sand, for then sand will be cheap—very cheap.

In respect to these improvements, demanded in the name of good government, the ways of our Democratic friends are like the ways of Providence, and there the likeness ceases—they are mysterious and past finding out.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the reduction of the income of the Government. It is in my judgment obviously unjust and illogical to continue to strip the people of the country of seventy-odd millions of money per year, only to see it added to the other worse than useless millions already locked up in the Treasury.

And particularly is it necessary that this be done at once, when we see and admit that neither will the Executive recommend nor the majority in Congress pass laws that will apply what is in the Treasury, or is to be, to the manifest needs of the people.

Under this state of things not to advocate reduction, and accomplish it if we can, is, in my judgment, for us to become partakers in the evil of a policy denounced alike by the friends and foes of the Administration.

I wish to see the incomes reduced to the expenses. Not necessarily to the expenses narrowed down to the narrowest possible limit of the needs of the Government, but reduced as far as is consistent with liberal provisions for the conduct of its affairs, including provisions for the payment of the maturing public debts and the making of needed public improvements.

And I am for this being done by the Republican party, or if it can not be done by them, they being in the minority here, I am still in favor of an intelligent, determined, and fearless attempt to do it.

I am tired of that policy that asks us of the West to stand upon nothing but the neutral defense of a negative, of a denial of the efficacy of proposed remedial legislation. In the Forty-eighth Congress we stood upon our objection that the case made by the Morrison bill did not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. Evidently the court of public opinion sustained us, as may be claimed by the significant loss of seats in this House then held by Democrats. But notwithstanding the qualified success of the negative policy of the Republican party in that contest, for one, I did not then approve it, and do not now wish to see it applied in the trial of this case, neither here nor to the people. We are entitled to a judgment on the merits in this controversy, and not to a judgment by default.

I am not indifferent to the difficulties of the situation, nor unmindful that it becomes me to be subordinate, and I hope that when I ask for affirmative action by the Republican party it will not be taken as treason to, or lack of faith in, the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, upon whom must fall the initial labor of preparing, digesting, and presenting a measure to be opposed to the measure presented by the majority of that committee and now pending before the House.

In the old time we drew power and honor from the fact of what we did, and not from the fact of what we objected to others doing. Suppose it be conceded in advance that we can not pass a bill for the reform of the duty and tax laws, does that excuse us from the trial, and a trial in which measure shall be opposed to measure? Do we not hold a better place in the coming controversy if we can say that we were defeated in an effort to modify those laws, than we would if we could only say that we defeated an effort, however crude, sectional, and dangerous, of our political adversaries to modify them?

The people can comprehend an effort to do something; can they as well comprehend an effort to prevent that something from being done? The people realize that they are between two dangers, one from the accumulation of unneeded taxes, the other from an ill-advised effort to reduce those taxes, so ill-advised that it amounts to a selfish, sectional, and cowardly blow at the American policy of protection.

It is our duty to protect them from both evils if we can, and I am for the effort. Let us do justice to the South and compel the South to do justice to the North and West, thus sustaining the confidence of the great Northern and Western constituencies in our willingness to defend all sections and all interests; and whether victorious or defeated we will reap our reward in a return to power of the only party with a policy big enough to comprehend the good of all.

And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, the appeal to history satisfies me that the only practical hope the country has for substantial relief is in the Republican party. That party has had control of the House of Representatives where, under the Constitution, all bills affecting taxes must originate, from 1866 down to March 4, 1875, and thereafter from March 4, 1881, to March 4, 1883, eleven years. The Democrats have had control from 1875 to 1881, and from 1883 to the present time, also eleven years.

During the eleven years of Republican control the revenues were reduced $362,000,000, as follows:

1. Acts of July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867	$103,380,000
2. Acts of March 1868, and February, 1868	54,800,000
3. Acts of July, 1870	81,320,000
4. Acts of December, 1871	14,400,000
5. Acts of May, 1872, tea and coffee (free-list)	15,900,000
6. Acts of June, 1872	31,000,000
7. Acts of March 3, 1883 (estimated)	61,200,000
Grand total under Republican rule	362,000,000

During the eleven years of control the Democratic party has reduced the revenues $6,370,000. This was at the rate of something over $500,000 a year.

This reduction was made by taking the internal-revenue taxes off of whisky, tobacco, and snuff. It may be imagined that this reduction, particularly that on snuff, was a great relief to American labor, particularly that portion of the American laborers who gain their living by sneezing.

This comparison of the achievments of the two parties will cast some light on the question of which party has favored and maintained war taxes.

The advocates of the Mills bill are claiming now, and have always claimed, that all the crimes against industry are concentrated in what they call the "war taxes." If so, what a pitiful lack of conscience and courage, and what fertility of incapacity, has that party displayed during its eleven years of control.

The West, or at least that section with which I am familiar, asks for free coal, free salt, free lumber, and free sugar, and for the removal or reduction of the duties on other articles of necessary daily consumption where not in conflict with like articles of American manufacture or production, and for the modification of duties on necessaries wherever it can be done without injury to American labor.

In addition to this we would like to see taxes taken from alcohol when used in the arts and sciences, and from tobacco until such a reduction is made as will reduce the incomes to the legitimate needs of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Mills bill is offered as a means of relief against the further collection of unnecessary duties and taxes. If current history can be trusted, there are certain things connected with this measure which dishonor it at the start.

It is said that this bill was conceived in secret; that the Democratic majority were not aided in its formulation by their Republican colleagues; that they did not sit in the place appointed by law for their sessions, but in a place unknown to their colleagues and the public; that they thereby defeated the effort of the industries of the country to be heard, and denied the right of petition. If this be true, then the Congress is asked to honor with its confidence and give consideration to a measure born in defiance of the rule that the only adequate protection to private interest, as well as public honor, is to be found in the open and public consideration by the committee of the House of the matters intrusted to them by Congress.

The merit of this measure is that it puts salt and lumber on the free-list, and its disgrace is that it does not put coal and sugar there also; and it falls, so far as I am concerned, before this one overwhelming objection. It strikes the tax off these staples of the North and West—salt, lumber, and wool—and it does not strike the same tax off of the sugar, coal, iron, or rice of the South. It does not go as far as it ought to go as to coal and sugar, and the reason why it does not appears to be clearly and entirely political and sectional.

It comes to us of the West declaring that we, in respect to our interests, are not entitled to the same consideration that they of the South are. It strikes duties from imports that may disadvantageously affect Michigan and Wisconsin lumber and salt and Western wool, but it continues them upon Virginia coal, Louisiana sugar, and Georgia and Alabama iron.

Coal is an absolute necessity of life, and sugar is as indispensable to the comfort of the home of the poor as to that of the rich. They are not less demanded than lumber and salt. Put them all on an equality. We ask in this nothing sectional; the West has coal, so have the East, the North, and the South. Put them all upon an equality. We ask in this no sectional advantage, and we will submit to none.

As this bill stands under the old schedule you collect $59,000,000 of duty to protect $17,000,000 of sugar produced in Louisiana, and you take all protection from 265,000,000 pounds of American wool for the benefit of the 114,000,000 pounds of foreign wool imported into this country during the last fiscal year. You put the raw wool of the farmer on the free-list, and you leave the duty on the grade of woolen goods which he must buy. Thus, according to your theory of the operation of the laws of trade, on the one hand you rob him of the advantage of the tariff on his product, and, on the other, to borrow your own language, you allow the manufacturer to "rob" him again by adding the duty on his goods, which duty you refuse to remove, to the price which the farmer must pay for them as necessaries.

You strike duties from salt, and you refuse to take them from coal. You make lumber free, and you protect iron. Are not these things all equally necessary to the comfort of men? And if so, why are they not treated as such as a matter of principle? To do otherwise is a trick, and your bill is nothing but an intrigue—a bribe paid to a section you fear. Your bill confesses that you have broken the great principle of equality, fundamental to good Government, in the interest of a party, to

conciliate a section. With your hands full of power you dare not do justice; you are frightened at the omnipotence of a principle.

Mr. Chairman, while on the sectional aspect of the proposed legislation, allow me to present two tables taken from the Census report, which present the facts as they are as to the relative interest in and possible benefits derived from the system of protection as between the North and South.

The protection on articles of import competing in the American market against like products of the West and North, is as follows:

Farm imports, dutiable.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Animals (page 791):			
Cattle	72,665	$979,696	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Horses	38,725	2,464,303	Do.
Sheep	451,253	1,187,847	Do.
Total		4,631,846	
Breadstuffs (page 791):			
Barley ... bushels	10,355,594	6,173,208	10 cents per bushel.
Corn ... do	30,536	16,636	Do.
Oats ... do	87,380	29,579	Do.
Oatmeal ... pounds	939,502	37,857	½ cent per pound.
Rye ... bushels	18,469	10,720	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat ... do	277,842	218,867	20 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour..barrels	1,013	3,302	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		150,059	
Total		6,640,228	
Hay (page 795) ... tons	78,368	790,394	$2 per ton.
Hops (page 795)..pounds	18,538,049	3,404,669	8 cents per pound.
Malt barley (page 796), bushels	209,960	153,363	20 cents per bushel.
Provisions (page 797):			
Meat products, extracts		272,651	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		162,202	1 to 2 cents per pound.
Dairy:			
Butter ... pounds	236,100	38,125	4 cents per pound.
Cheese ... do	6,592,192	874,261	Do.
Milk, condensed		459,000	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Total		1,806,239	
Vegetables (page 799):			
Beans, peas..bushels	648,388	607,853	10 per cent. ad valorem.
Potatoes ... do	1,432,490	543,091	15 per cent. per bushel.
Pickles, etc.		387,177	35 per cent.
All other, natural		516,319	10 per cent. ad valorem.
All other, preserved		295,911	35 per cent. ad valorem.
Total		2,350,351	
Wool (page 800):			
Clothing wools..lbs	17,963,982	3,431,567	2½ to 12 cents per pound.
Combing wools..do	10,721,753	2,528,560	Do.
Carpet, etc. ... do	85,352,295	10,464,352	Do.
Total	114,038,030	16,424,479	
Flax, etc. (page 794):			
Flax ... tons	7,140	1,922,182	$5 to $40 per ton.

RECAPITULATION.

Animals	$4,631,846	Vegetables	2,350,351
Breadstuffs	6,640,228	Wool, raw	16,424,479
Hay	790,394	Flax	1,922,182
Hops	3,404,669		
Barley, malt	153,363	Total	38,123,751
Provisions	1,806,239		

So much for the Northern farmer. The Southern farmer and planter is protected as follows:

Farm imports, dutiable.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Hemp, etc. (page 794):			
Hemp ... tons	32,739	$4,041,522	$25 per ton.
Jute ... do	88,514	2,616,128	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Sisal grass, etc..do	36,355	3,733,001	$15 per ton.
Total		10,390,651	
Fruits (pages 794, 795):			
Figs ... pounds	8,724,583	487,692	2 cents.
Lemons		3,835,147	30 cents per box, 16 cents per half box, $2 per 1,000.
Oranges		2,408,140	25 cents per box, 13 cents per half box, $1.60 per 1,000.
Prunes ... pounds	92,032,625	2,999,648	
Raisins ... do	40,673,288	2,281,981	2 cents.
Preserved fruit		748,493	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		1,799,462	35 per cent. ad valorem.
Almonds	5,482,362	597,476	5 cents per pound, 7 cents per pound shelled.
All others		682,878	2 cents per pound.
Total		15,840,827	

Farm imports, dutiable—Continued.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Rice (page 798):			
In grain ... pounds	46,765,394	$922,305	1½ to 2½ cents per pound.
Granulated ... do	47,921,263	754,089	Do.
Total	94,686,659	1,674,394	
Sugar, molasses, etc. (page 799):			
Molasses ... gallons	37,894,126	5,340,763	4 to 8 cents per gallon.
Sugar, to No. 13, pounds	2,918,103,240	69,153,830	1.4 cents per pound.
Sugar, Nos. 13 to 20, pounds	25,043	1,017	3 cents.
Sugar, above No. 20, pounds	24,122	1,026	3.5.
Candy		22,971	5 cents per pound.
Total		74,519,607	
Tobacco (page 799):			
Leaf wrappers	54,939	49,430	75 cents to $1 per pound.
All other	17,464,255	8,655,520	35 cents per pound.
Total	17,519,104	8,704,950	
Total		111,130,429	

The balance of protection in favor of Southern interests as against Northern and Western, as shown by this table, is $73,006,678—only a trifle, but such a trifle as this will open the eyes of the West if it can not waken the conscience of the majority of this House.

It will be observed from this table that the principal advantage to Northern agriculturists comes from the duty laid on imported wool, which is $16,424,479, and that this is now proposed to be taken from the Western farmer and presented to the foreign growers of wool. It will be observed also that the principal item of protection to the Southern planter is that on sugar and cane products, to wit, $74,519,607, and this is to be maintained with slight modification. And this is done by a party that says that it is not the enemy of American manufacturers, laborers, and producers; that it has come to power like the Holy One of old, to prepare the way of redemption of these same laborers and producers from the bondage of war taxes. Sugar is protected to the extent of $56,000,000 a year, or $1 per head of the entire population of the United States, paid into the Treasury as duty on the imported sugar consumed by the country.

The purpose for which this vast levy is made is the protection of the Louisiana and other Southern planters who produce $17,000,000 worth of the sugar consumed by the people. That is, the general consumers pay enough in duty on the supply of sugar, over and above the home product, to buy that home product more than three times over.

And notwithstanding this enormous tax of $1 per head on the population of the United States, the industry of sugar-growing in the South, it is said, has steadily decreased. And still a party flying the banners of reform, pledged to tariff reduction to the level of the revenue needs of the Government, such tariff when reduced to be so adjusted as to protect American industry and cheapen imported necessaries, proceeds to reform the tariff by letting alone an outrage which robs the tax-ridden people (Democratic stereotype) of at least fifty millions of money for nothing.

I would not refuse protection to the sugar interests of the South, but would levy only such a duty on imported sugar as would pay a reasonable bounty to the growers of American sugar. The effect of raising sixty millions of revenue from sugar, an imported necessary of life, will be seen in the removal or reduction of duties on other imports, which duties are necessary to protect American producers; and, sir, here is an example of it.

The following table shows the effect of Democratic tariff reform on certain Western farm products:

Products.	Canadian rate.	United States rate.	Mills rate.
Potatoes	10 cts. per bushel	15 cts. per bushel	Free.
Beans	15 cts. per bushel	10 per cent	Free.
Peas	10 cts. per bushel	10 and 20 per cent	Free.
Tomatoes	30 cts. per bushel	10 per cent	Free.
All other vegetables, including sweet potatoes.	20 per cent	10 per cent	Free.
Plums	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	Free.
Currants	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	Free.
Peppermint and other essential oils.	20 per cent	25 per cent	Free.
Blacking	25 per cent	25 per cent	20 per cent.
Bricks	20 per cent	20 per cent	Free.
Brooms	25 per cent	25 per cent	20 per cent.
Brushes	25 per cent	25 per cent	20 per cent.
Flax (raw)	$20 per ton	$20 per ton	Free.
Flax (hackled)	$40 per ton	$40 per ton	Free.
Tow	$10 per ton	$10 per ton	Free.
Meats, game, and poultry			Free.

At present the tariff on agricultural products is:

Products.	Duty.	Nebraska raises.
		Bushels.
Barley	10 cents per bushel	2,612,000
Corn	do	127,852,000
Corn-meal	do	
Oats	do	20,674,000
Rye	do	1,774,500
Wheat	20 cents per bushel	13,895,000
Flour	20 per cent	
Flax-seed	20 cents per bushel	387,490
Potatoes	15 cents per bushel	4,100,000
Linseed-oil	25 cents per gallon	
Beer (grain)	20 to 35 per cent	
Bologna sausage (beef)	3 cents per pound	
Beef and pork	1 cent per pound	
Butter	4 cents per pound	15,620,000
Cheese	do	
Hams	2 cents per pound	
Hay	$2 per ton	
Honey	20 cents per gallon	191,260

And the ultimate effect of the "free-list" on American agriculture can be better estimated when it is understood that, notwithstanding protection, there was imported into this country during the year ending June 30, 1887, $197,308,240 of foreign agricultural products, of which only 46,678,443 paid no duty.

Having so adjusted the "reform" of the tariff as to put the great staples of the North and West on the free-list and leave those of the South on the protected list, having reformed us down and them up, what becomes of the promise to protect American labor so far as the same could be done by a tariff for revenue? In the light of these sectional discriminations where is America anyway? Will not some one hand the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means a map of the United States? Is the North and the West to be wiped from the map so as to make the way clear for this conspiracy in favor of sectional reform?

Before I leave this subject, Mr. Chairman, there is still another reason why the commodities I have named, to wit, lumber, salt, coal, and sugar, should go on the free-list, and that is that they have in a large measure fallen into the hands of trusts and combinations against trade; and these monster conspiracies are abusing privileges granted to the commodities, but not granted to operators in such commodities. The ability of these trusts to coerce or crush individual operators and drive all competition from the field is aided, if not made possible, alone by the Cleveland "corner" and "trust" on the money of the nation. The scarcity of money caused by the Treasury "lock-up" makes the vast sums held by the "combines" almost omnipotent. Between the Government "combine" and the "trusts" fair dealing trembles for its life, and the time has come for heroic remedies. And so I say to this extent let in the world and let its coal, lumber, salt, and sugar combat with these iniquities that have fastened themselves to our vital resources, and will, if not checked or killed, yet lay us under tribute for our own earth, air, and water, laying their impious hands upon the very gifts of God.

In the course of this debate some of the gentlemen speaking for the bill have seen fit to assail the present prosperity of the West and to libel its future prospects, hoping to gain its support for this measure by arming its prejudice against its reason and its interest.

The West will be able to discover that its immediate ills are not chargeable to a system under which for twenty-five years of Republican rule it enjoyed a phenomenal growth, and under which system, with certain modifications, it still expects to repeat the results of the past.

It will understand the motive which has withheld the money of the country from circulation in order to create in the surplus an argument to crush the system of American protection. They will use the errors of the enemies of this system, not to destroy themselves, but to punish those who committed the error, counting upon their inability to discover the motive and assign the cause.

I submit herewith a showing that will convince our solicitous friends that Nebraska is not likely to make an assignment at once for the benefit of either the Administration or the Mills bill, and also that there is no immediate danger of our being sold out from inability to pay either the interest or principal of our debts.

NEBRASKA UNDER PROTECTION.

Population:	
1880	452,000
1885	740,000
1888, probably	1,300,000

An increase in between 1880 and 1885 of 62 per cent., and in eight years of 187 per cent.

Farms:	
1880	63,387
1885	99,857

An increase of 56 per cent. in five years.

Manufactories:	
1880	1,403
1885	2,861

An increase of 100 per cent.

Employed in all occupations	154,000
Employed in agriculture	90,507

Or about 60 per cent.; but the 40 per cent. is a large minority, and also deserves attention.

1880—In trade and transportation	15,100

Or about 10 per cent.

In manufacturing, mechanical, and mining	18,200

Or, say, 12 per cent.

In other industries	28.700

Or about 17 per cent.

These figures do not show a tax-ridden, cursed section of country, nor a population beggared by the American policy of protection; quite the contrary.

Take the wool industry of Nebraska:

1880, number of sheep	199,453
1885, number of sheep	444,013

An increase of 120 per cent.

1880, wool sold ... pounds	1,282,656
1885, wool sold ... do	2,060,483

An increase of 60 per cent.

1880, value of farms	$105,932,000
1885, value of farms	285,946,000

An increase of 175 per cent.

1880, value of products	$31,708,000
1885, value of products	52,035,000

An increase of 65 per cent.

The great basis for the conclusions drawn, and sought to be drawn, against the protective system in this country by those advocating the passage of the Mills bill is that the duties levied upon imports are so high as to amount to a practical embargo upon such imports, and that this embargo is dual in its operation, not only excluding (foreign) imports from this country, but in its reactionary effects excluding domestic products, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, from profitable export, thus producing as a secondary result a demoralizing condition of the home market, a glut which threatens to crush both capital and labor in a common ruin.

Whether the conditions described by the advocates of the bill in question exist at all or not, it is not now my purpose, further than I already have, to consider. If the objection here urged to the tariff is true, then it constitutes a reason for its reduction, but not for its destruction. Let it be reduced, but let the reduction be non-sectional, and so far as consistent with the admitted necessity of reduction let it protect American labor and the home market of American producers.

The mistake is in assuming that these laws have produced these conditions. The reverse is rather the truth. Certain conditions have produced these laws, or rather certain conditions in which American labor and property found itself have produced them. They sprang from the knowledge which American toil and property has that it owns this country, and owns also the power to govern it by law, and to make the laws by which it shall be governed, and to so make the laws as to hold the natural advantages of its own country for its own use.

These laws have a deeper meaning to me than mere dollars and cents. On the surface they seem to deal with questions of daily economy and finance; on a profounder view they deal with the great questions of whether a government founded on the abstract right of the absolute equality of men, rooted in a new soil, can maintain itself at any cost in a combat with the forms, laws, and conditions of old governments, based upon the denial of the fundamental truths that we hold sacred. Our adversaries in trade, as in war, represent a social and trade condition based upon the self-imposed authority of the few and the benighted submission of the many. Their product is the output of millions who bow their necks to the yoke of toil, patient as the brute, held in order by the transmitted degradation of ancestors whose vassal lives, rooted tree-like to the soil, passed body and soul with the feudal fee. Our laws, representing conditions of man and matter, never like those of England, proclaim it to be the policy of American labor and capital that those conditions shall remain eternally different.

If a dollar is the only object of government, then the American Revolution was a failure. Submission to England would have been a commercial success. We should have saved the tea in Boston Harbor—and sold it. You can not organize a board of trade to-day on the business principles of the Declaration of Independence. If the only measure for the aspirations of man is a yard-stick or a gold-piece, then free government might as well go out of business. If what is wanted in the world is cheap men, then the proclamation of emancipation was an outrage, and the blood shed to free the slaves was infamous.

If we must meet Europe on her own ground, we must find men to do it with—our own men will not. They can be carried up, but not down; they have power and can not be cheated out of its use or its rights. You say, let us trade. With whom—with Europe? To what end—that Europe may become like us, or we like it? You say, give

us a market, and, looking abroad, you blind your eyes to a continent. What would you trade? Civilizations, systems, destinies? No; no. The Republic born of revolutions exists to demonstrate that in one extreme the heights of a free man's destiny can not be measured by a monarch's scepter, nor in another by the daily price and condition of a practical bondman, enslaved by traditions and class conditions which American labor, armed in its own defense, put under its feet a hundred years ago.

These laws and conditions in which this country finds itself, and of which the gentlemen complain, are not conditions imposed by the mere *ipse dixit* of the legislator. They are conditions fixed in the very nature of things, and one of the things in which they are fixed is the heart and soul of a free man who has a country and purposes to keep it; and our laws and limitations upon imports are laws and limitations imposed in the effort of labor to protect itself, to retain the advantage which belongs to it as the discoverer and owner of a continent, and the owner of the right and power to govern the same by a vote which belongs to it. It is in its last analysis the application to the business of government of the first law of nature by the man who holds as his own divine right the power to make laws, Congresses, Presidents, and to shape policies for the conduct of that government; and whether right or wrong it is made by the man who is responsible in this exercise of original power to his own conscience and judgment alone.

These men may err, but in my judgment they do not.

The logic of the tendency of the argument in support of the bill under discussion asks a nation, where all are masters, to enter a business battle to the death with a nation or nations whose laws and policies are shaped by and almost of necessity made in the interest of classes—governing classes—headed by a crowned or sceptered potentate, supported by hereditary aristocracy, and based, not upon the consent, but the submission of the people.

The answer that the policy of the existing laws makes, it seems to me is the only answer that a policy based upon the votes of a free and self-governing people can make to the policies of a nation whose laws of trade spring from persons holding power by privilege, and not by right, and whose benefits are absorbed by the few and not by the many.

The protective policy speaks of the fact that no American has lived who has had to think of the difference in the condition of the people of a nation that govern themselves and one where they do not. Prince Bismarck, speaking in the German Parliament, exclaimed, "the German has not lived who has not had to arm himself against the Gaul." And so it is here. Freedom, based upon the homes of the people, the self-respecting independence of its masses, the rooted intelligence radiated from vast systems of free schools and colleges, has no choice but to guard her home against oppression and all that it produces, for if we must meet Europe upon her plane it must be at the peril of institutions and conditions existing here necessary to our existence which do not exist there, and can not. And the perpetual appeal which is raised from this side of the House is not in any right sense alone an appeal for American labor. It is an appeal for what rests upon, is defended by, and made possible by it, and that is the American system, the Government itself.

And so, whatever modifications either party or all parties may make—and there are many that should, and I trust will, be made—let it be remembered that so far as I can speak for one section of this country, as nearly disinterested as any section can be, let it be remembered, I repeat, that the West has wheat for sale, and corn, and cattle, and all the products of the earth. But her interest in American protection as a policy, as a bulwark of American liberty, sacred to all mankind, and especially to American labor, is not for sale.

And that party does not now live, nor shall it ever live, which, call it what you will, shall be able to draw the deed for its deliverance over to our one-time British masters, except upon terms dictated by American labor, for to this we all stand committed by obligations that are national and not personal, patriotic if not profitable, an obligation more sacred than an oath subscribed, as sacred as the blood that in the heroic days washed the stain off English pollution from off the virgin continent and drove the Hessians out, that come what will, be it weal or woe, be it the cowardice of the weak, the mistakes of the wise, the insolence of the strong, the treason of one section or the revolt of another, the fall or rise of fortune, the power of pools, the combinations of trusts that with one hand crushes contracts and with the other raises the red flag of anarchy, the mad appeal of the demagogue, the bloody cry of the commune, the desperate appeal of the strike, the wreck of fortune and the crash of commerce, come all the evils that government is heir to, only so they be American and they shall be conquered in the interest of the Republic, whose destiny it is to demonstrate in its own political personality not only the eternal worth of freedom to man, but the eternal possibility of that freedom preserved through government.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the oral discussion of this measure with great interest, and after the publication of the speeches in the RECORD I have read many of them over with care in the quietude of my room. The result with me is an overwhelming conviction that this is a fair and liberal bill, and that it is my duty to support it. I believe it to be an honest effort on the part of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means to relieve the people. The framers of this bill have, as I shall show, manifested a fairness and liberality towards the protected industries which those industries and the lines of business connected with them utterly refuse to extend to the great body of the people who use and consume their wares and products.

It is conceded by all that the revenues now derived from import duties, internal taxes, and miscellaneous sources are annually about $60,000,000 in excess of necessary expenditures. It is agreed, even under the method of Treasury book-keeping, that there are $100,000,000 now in the Treasury in excess of current demands, and that the daily receipts are swelling this amount rapidly and constantly. With an individual this would afford evidence of unusual prosperity, but to the nation it is a danger signal that can not be passed by unheeded. Now, what shall be done? The question is of the highest importance, and calls for practical business solution. If the money of the country continues to filter through the custom-houses and the internal-revenue offices into the great reservoir of the Treasury and remains there, enterprise must inevitably succumb.

If the sea should refuse to give back the floods which empty into it the plains would soon become parched, the rivers would cease to flow, and all life would perish. Nature in her wise economy forbids this. Now our Treasury surplus, present and prospective, is not the result of sound and prudent financiering. It is the effect of unwise and improvident legislation. How the authors of our present embarrassed situation can have the effrontery to claim that they alone are worthy of being intrusted with the revision of our revenue laws is more than I can understand. The difficulties at present surrounding us are the result of their folly. The situation is certainly not the result of wise forecast. Was it wise and prudent to provide by law for the annual collection from the people of $60,000,000 more than is necessary to meet every anticipated demand, and then provide no method of speedily and profitably returning this money to the channels of trade?

Our present revenue laws were enacted with full knowledge of the certain increase of population and expansion of business. The extent of our foreign trade, of immigration, the sums total of exports and imports, all these factors were taken into account, and must have been substantially foreseen. Instead of prudently reserving the right to annually redeem at par an amount of interest-bearing bonds equal to any surplus money that might from time to time accumulate, instead of a wise reservation like this, you in effect enacted that there should be a surplus and then clothed the holder of public securities with power to extort blood-money in the shape of unconscionable premiums. After this stupendous blunder—to use no harsher term—after you have poisoned the body-politic, by what authority and upon what grounds do you claim the exclusive privilege of treating the patient? [Applause.] The conditions which embarrass us at the present session of Congress are not new. Your attention has for years been called to the congested condition of the Treasury, and to the depletion going on elsewhere.

The honorable gentlemen who oppose this bill are traveling a rough and thorny road. Their eyes are open to the fact that the people are overtaxed, that they are deprived of their circulating medium, more and more of which is daily being locked up in the Treasury. They are aware that this surplus must rapidly increase under existing laws. They are aware that unless the causes which produce these results are removed or promptly modified the business health of the country must continue to steadily decline. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means have united in presenting to the House and to the country a scheme for tax reduction.

Gentlemen of the Republican side of the House, have you met it with a bill of your own? No; the gentlemen composing the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means in the views which they submitted, say they will seek to amend and modify the bill in the Committee of the Whole House, but they do not state the character of the amendments and modifications which they will offer. Failing in this they declare they will offer a substitute for the bill, but they append no draft of such substitute. That, too, is kept in the dark and excluded from this discussion. No opportunity has been given, gentlemen, to compare the proposed substitute with the pending bill, nor has it been given to the country. Indeed, it is clear that you have not agreed upon a substitute, and you can not agree upon one among yourselves. A majority of you agree upon one thing, and one only—that you are opposed to this bill. So far as any substantive proposition is concerned you are as wide apart as the poles.

In the Republican national platform for 1884 you inserted the following plank:

> The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff, and to reduce the surplus.

Now, this is the whole party speaking with authority. It is both a declaration and an admission which should estop any member of that party from denying that our present tariff laws are unjust in their operation and need correcting. Here is another declaration made by the Republican party of my own State. In the Iowa platform the party declares:

> We believe the tariff should be revised and reduced.

It will be observed that this declaration relates to the tariff as a whole, and declares that it ought to be reduced. We on this side of

the House agree with them, and because we have undertaken to make the reduction, and prevent surplus accumulations in the Treasury, we are denounced as free-traders, and accused of trying to unsettle the business prosperity of the country.

But how has the Republican party kept the pledge which it made in the platform of 1884? They violated it outright in the Forty-eighth Congress by voting solidly to strike out the enacting clause of the bill then before the House—a bill to correct the inequalities of the tariff and prevent surplus accumulation.

In the Forty-ninth Congress, standing in the presence of all their pledges, State and national, to reduce the tariff, and with full knowledge that the surplus was accumulating, and that under present laws it would continue to accumulate, by a solid Republican vote in this Hall you refused even to consider the question. And to-day, instead of presenting to the country a candid and plain proposition of relief, your attitude is one of obstruction. No longer strong enough to prevent consideration, you are now really on the retreat, and are putting in the time burning bridges, tearing up culverts, and felling trees across the road along which we must advance in our work of relief. [Applause.]

A Republican Senator from my own State, Hon. JAMES F. WILSON, in his speech delivered on the floor of the Senate April 5, 1888 (RECORD, page 2871, first session Fiftieth Congress), says:

Mr. President, we are still confronted with our annual surplus revenue of about $60,000,000. Is there no way by which we can get rid of it without disturbing our true industrial condition? It seems to me there is a way which is both short and clear. We have one public tax the gross yield per annum of which more than equals the reduction of revenue we are called on to make. The tax on intoxicating liquors is the one to which I refer. This is where I would make the reduction.

This gentleman has the right to speak for his party in the State of Iowa, as he has just been re-elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States. In view of the fact that he would now make the reduction on internal-revenue taxes solely, and on the one article alone of intoxicating liquors, I would like to know what has become of the pledges made by his party in national convention and in his own State to "revise and reduce" the tariff? He utterly ignores them, spits upon them, and tramples them under his feet. We in Iowa accept the issue thus tendered. We say the reduction shall be made on the necessaries of life; on the lumber that shelters our people, and out of which our houses and barns and granaries must be constructed. It shall be made on the clothing our people wear, the food they eat, the salt that seasons their frugal meals, the implements they use in their daily toil, upon the blankets that keep us and our little ones warm when the mercury is below zero, and upon steel rails, the cost of which enters so materially into the cost of transporting our produce to market, and we will go before our people and ask them to decide between us. [Applause.]

But the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] has made a new departure. He has not always been in favor of making the reduction on whisky. In the year 1866, in the Thirty-ninth Congress, he voted to fix the duty on railroad iron at 50 cents per hundred pounds, and so did his colleague, Senator ALLISON. (See Globe, volume 59, page 2723, first session Thirty-ninth Congress.) It is the long ton of 2,240 pounds that is meant here, which would make the duty $11.20 per ton—only 20 cents per ton, less than 1 cent per 100 pounds, above the rate fixed by the Mills bill. Now, if fixing the duty on steel and iron rails in this bill at $11 per ton makes its author and those who support it free-traders, then Mr. WILSON in 1866 had a very narrow escape. All he lacked at that early day of being an abominable free-trader was 20 cents to the long ton. Saved as by fire!

But let us look at his record some fourteen years later. This will give ample time for both his judgment and his experience to ripen. In the year 1880 we find him before the Ways and Means Committee of this House, and, strange to say, still urging a reduction on steel rails. The honorable gentleman made an elaborate argument in favor of reduction, and at the conclusion of his remarks was cross-examined by the committee. I read from page 44 of a pamphlet containing the notes of a hearing had before the Ways and Means Committee on the 3d, 4th, and 5th days of February, 1880:

Mr. KELLEY. What rate of duty would you indicate on steel rails?
Mr. WILSON. I have left that somewhat to the consideration of the committee, but I should judge that the steel-rail interest of the country would be abundantly promoted at a duty of $14 a ton.
Mr. KELLEY. And what is the sum that you would name?
Mr. WILSON. I think it could stand a less duty than that.
Mr. TUCKER. What do you think of $10 a ton?
Mr. WILSON. I think it could stand a duty of $10 a ton.

Here you have it! Why, the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] puts it in the present bill at $11 per ton. That makes him a better protectionist than the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and establishes the fact that Mr. WILSON exceeds the honorable gentleman from Texas as a free-trader to the extent of $1 per long ton. [Applause.]

I call attention to the fact that the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] did not appear before the Ways and Means Committee in 1880 to urge a reduction of the tax on intoxicating liquors, although the tax was raging at that time. His point of attack at that date was the steel-rail monopoly, and this is where he would then have made the reduction.

And at the conclusion of Mr. WILSON's remarks before the committee Mr. Morrison said:

You have made but one mistake, and that is in claiming to be a protectionist. I claim you on the other side.

[Laughter.]

But let us see how my Republican colleagues in the present House view the situation. The honorable gentleman from the Fifth district [Mr. KERR], in a speech upon the pending bill, delivered from his seat on this floor April 28, 1888, speaking of the position taken by Senator WILSON, declares that he has no hesitation in giving in his adhesion to the doctrine that the reduction should be made from the tax on intoxicating liquors. He says he unhesitatingly made this declaration early in the session of the present Congress. The honorable Senator is thus re-enforced by another Republican leader of our State. (See page 3641, first session Fiftieth Congress.)

My colleague, Colonel HENDERSON, would make the reduction solely on sugar. (See RECORD, page 3679, first session Fiftieth Congress.) Is this reduction on a single article the revision of the tariff which was promised in the Republican platforms above quoted? If the position taken by the gentleman in other parts of his speech be correct, namely, that American industry will perish unless protected from foreign competition, what will be the effect upon our American sugar plantations when the fostering care of protection is entirely withdrawn? Upon the gentleman's theory I convict him of intending to destroy the American sugar industry.

My colleague and friend of protection, Governor GEAR, from the First district, also has some evil design upon the sugar industry of America, for he, too, declares that he would make the reduction on sugar. That is his interpretation of Republican pledges, State and national. He, too, strikes at a single industry. Now, here we have two honorable Representatives from Iowa declaring that the reduction shall be made on sugar, and two, Mr. KERR and Senator WILSON, that it shall be made on whisky. Both can not be accommodated. The pending bill makes a reduction of 22 per cent. on sugar, but none on whisky. Would it not be advisable for these gentlemen to compromise for the sake of harmony? Take part of the tax from whisky and part from sugar and then mix them? [Laughter and applause.] That great necessary of life, raw whisky, could then be sweetened to suit the taste of the consumer. [Laughter.]

But when my colleague [Mr. GEAR], in his speech the other day, spread his pair of blankets before the House—blankets manufactured by my old personal friend, Isaiah Meek, at his establishment at Bonaparte, in the county adjoining to where I live—I felt alarmed, and greatly so when I heard him make the following statement:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that the passage of the pending tariff bill will not only seriously injure the wool-grower of my State, but it will also close up the mill where that blanket was made, and put out of employment the labor engaged in its manufacture.

When I heard this statement I flew around lively, for I am acquainted with Isaiah Meek, and if this bill was to have the effect of closing his woolen factory I desired to know about it. So straightway I turned to page 28 of the bill to see what it said about the tariff on blankets; and lo! and behold, I found the rate of duty in the present bill on blankets is 40 per cent. ad valorem. [Laughter.]

Is not that enough? This bill, if it becomes a law, will give Isaiah Meek cheaper raw material; it will give him wool at less cost than he is now paying for it; the wool-grower will be more than compensated in the reduced cost of the manufactured goods, the people can buy cheaper blankets, and Mr. Meek will still be protected by a 40 per cent. duty on the imported blanket. How then will this bill close up Isaiah Meek's establishment? I have written Mr. Meek and expect a reply soon; and I now predict that Isaiah Meek is in favor of the Mills bill. [Applause.] When I hear from him I shall make use of what he says under the five-minutes debate.

But my friend and colleague from the First district of Iowa [Mr. GEAR] has not always entertained the idea that a tax on sugar was the sole thing that is threatening the prosperity of this country; for in his inaugural address as governor of the State of Iowa, delivered before the Legislature of that State January 16, 1880, he said:

To a State whose products are in the main agricultural, as are those of Iowa, anything which enhances the cost of railways, thereby even incidentally in the least degree increasing the expense of the transportation of her products to the seaboard, which is her great market, is a question of great interest to all. In view of their greater strength and durability, which lessened the cost of replacement, all the great trunk railway lines of the country are adopting Bessemer steel rails. The manufacturers of this class of rails in the United States are controlled by a combination of not exceeding, I think, ten firms in number.

This combination is protected by a high and specific tariff, which prevents the importation of foreign rails to any extent, thereby increasing the cost of the railways of the country. Without discussing the tariff question in all its bearings it may well be considered whether it is wise legislation, by a tariff exceptional in its character, to put immense profits into the pockets of a monopoly composed of but few persons at the expense, indirectly, not only of Iowa farmers, but of the whole West. It would therefore be well to instruct our Senators and Representatives in Congress to examine into this subject with a view to removing by Congressional legislation any discriminations which may be found to exist in the tariff on steel rails against the interests of Iowa producers.

I call attention to the fact that the present bill makes a reduction of $6 per ton in the duty on steel rails. Reckoning 100 tons to the mile, and remembering the fact that we have in Iowa 5,000 miles of railway,

this would be a saving of $3,000,000 in the cost of replacing the rails now used upon the railways of my State; and the 8 per cent. which these corporations require as the return for capital invested would make an annual saving of $240,000 to the people of the State of Iowa for all time to come.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. WEAVER. No, sir; I am limited as to time, and I can not yield.

The number of miles of railway constructed last year was over 12,000. This bill, had it been the law, as it should have been, would have reduced the cost of construction $600 to the mile, a reduction of over $7,200,000 to the people of the United States, and a saving of 8 per cent. upon that would be $576,000 annually. [Applause.]

Mr. BRUMM. I would like to call the attention of my friend to one matter.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, I yield for a moment.

Mr. BRUMM. The gentleman makes his statement upon the hypothesis that the protective duty enhances the price of the rail while free trade will lower it, does he not?

Mr. WEAVER. Certainly; and if it does not——

Mr. BRUMM. I only wish to say——

Mr. WEAVER. No, I can not yield further. If the protective duty does not enhance the price of the rail, what do you want it for? [Laughter and applause.] In your cogitations in your room please brood over that question, and at some future time give the House an elaborate answer.

Mr. BRUMM. I will answer now in a minute if you will yield to me.

Mr. WEAVER. But I promised to show that the protected industries were unwilling to treat their customers with the same liberality with which they themselves are treated by our revenue laws.

The law of competition is a natural and humane provision, running through all human industries. It was given to man to curb his avarice, to make him kind, and to keep alive the brotherhood of the race. The maxim "live and let live" came from the golden rule. It is a wise provision of the Great Lawgiver growing out of the very existence of the human family upon the earth and of their business relations with one another. It is dangerous to interfere with its operation.

But our American manufacturers say they can not compete with manufacturers of older countries who employ cheap labor. "Protect us against the cheap labor of the Old World," they say, "and we will not interfere with home competition." "We can compete with our neighbors who are upon an equal footing with ourselves and pay their employés the same wage that we do." Now, these are the equities of the contract. The Government takes them at their word and tells the foreigner to stand off. We speak to him with authority, and tell him that he shall not place his foreign wares on the market in free competition with our home manufactures unless he is willing first to pay a heavy tax for such privilege.

We not only say this to the foreigner, but we make the same stern declaration to our own citizens, and say to them also, "You shall not buy abroad; you shall buy of the home manufacturer, unless you are willing to pay a penalty in the shape of a tax for making your purchases abroad." And then we say to both the foreigner and the citizen, "Look well to it that you obey the law. We will place patrols along every mile of our territorial boundary; we will build, arm, and equip revenue-cutters to guard every mile of our seacoast, and do so at your expense, to see that you obey the laws." This is right, you say. I agree with you. But are not the manufacturers thus protected under some moral obligation to deal fairly with the Government and the people who have dealt so kindly with them? How have they met this obligation?

Having secured protection from foreign competition, they straightway entered into the free-trade markets of the world to buy their labor. I prove this by reading from the testimony of Gilbert B. Whitman, agent of the Amory Manufacturing Company of Manchester, N. H., an establishment engaged extensively in the manufacture of cotton cloth. These works, at the time the testimony was given, in 1883, had only been running three years. This was started as a protected industry. Let me read from the examination as contained in the report entitled Labor and Capital:

Q. What is the character of your employés?

A. About one-third of our help are Canadians; the remainder are of mixed nationalities, the Irish element preponderating. Then come the English, the Scotch, and the German.

Q. What proportion of them are Americans?

A. Out of eight hundred operatives, probably we have eighty Americans.—*Labor and Capital*, volume 3, page 28.

That is the kind of return these manufacturing establishments give to the people for the protection the Government extends to them against foreign "pauper labor." They enter the free-trade market of the world, purchase foreign labor and bring it here, to exclude American labor. Is that good faith?

On this same point we have the testimony of Mr. Charles L. Harding, on page 296 of the same volume. Speaking of the woolen manufacture at Dedham, Mass., he says:

A large portion of the help we have in our mills now is foreign.

These are specimen manufacturing establishments. How is it in Pennsylvania, the great protected State of this Union? The laws of that Commonwealth give to mill-owners and factory managers and corporations the right to go to the governor of that State and demand that he shall commission as many corporation police as the owners of those establishments may deem necessary. They are commissioned in the name of the State, with power to arrest and detain; and it is made the duty of all sheriffs and prison-keepers to receive the persons arrested by them, and to confine them in prison. These corporation police are under the control, management, and authority of the corporation, and are required by law to wear the corporation badge. Thus the State is made the policeman of the protected industries, with the corporation as commander-in-chief. This is the kind of protection that labor gets in Pennsylvania.

I called the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to Brightly's Purdon's Digest, page 1338, of the Laws of Pennsylvania, and asked him whether that was not the law of his State. He said that he did not know whether it was the law of Pennsylvania or not. I was greatly astonished at the gentleman's answer. When the committee of this House which was authorized to investigate the labor strikes visited the coal region of Pennsylvania they found one hundred of these corporation policemen wearing the badge of their employers and drawing $2 per day for keeping their starving brethren in subjection. Thus the united power of the corporations and the Commonwealth were hurled against the people. Is this the happy condition to which we are all tending under protection? [Applause.]

This amounts to an alliance, offensive and defensive, between the powerful barons and the State—with the baron, however, as commander-in-chief.

Mr. BRUMM. Are not these same policemen under the employment of Mr. SCOTT?

Mr. WEAVER. I can not say whether they are or not. Mr. SCOTT can answer for himself.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I know they are.

Mr. WEAVER. I do not see how that makes my point less forcible.

Mr. BRUMM. It only shows that human nature is very much alike, whether a man is a free-trader or a protectionist.

Mr. WEAVER. But, sir, you are standing up here opposing the reduction of the duty on steel rails and on all Pennsylvania manufactures, when you must know that it is the capitalist alone who gets the benefit of protection, and that your laborers are growing poorer from year to year. [Applause.]

Now, while these corporations are protected before foreign competition, how are they treating the American laborer? Why, they have simply ignored the equities of their contract, and have gone with the free-trade market of the world and bought their labor where they could buy it the cheapest.

But, sir, they are not satisfied with this. Secure from foreign competition, they are now unwilling to endure competition among themselves, and so the "trust" is resorted to, which is the very refinement of monopoly and the destruction of competition. Sir John Culpepper, in a speech in the Long Parliament, said of the brood of monopolies then infesting England:

They are a nest of wasps—a swarm of vermin which have overcrept the land. Like the frogs of Egypt, they have gotten possession of our dwellings and we have scarce a room free from them. They sup in our cup, they dip in our dish, they sit by our fire. We find them in the dye-pot, wash-bowl, and powdering-tub. They share with the butter in his box. They will not bate us a pin. We may not buy our clothes without their brokage. These are the leeches that have sucked the commonwealth so hard that it is almost hectical.

I will name a few of the protected industries and connected lines of business which are controlled by trusts: Linseed-oil, watches and watch-cases, rope and cordage, salt, nails, screws, envelopes, iron beams for houses, bridges, etc.; terra-cotta goods, wall-paper and paperhangings, candy, bagging, the manufacture of steel, barbed wire, plated ware, upholsterer's goods, galvanized sheet-iron, castor-oil, gutta-percha goods, tacks, wrenches and hinges, boiler-flues, glass, lumber, writing-paper, wrapping-paper, wooden-ware, oil-cloth, carpets, silver plate.

This exhibit is taken from standard authorities. I refer to an article by Henry D. Lloyd in the North American Review for June, 1884, and from a recent work on "Trusts," by William W. Cook, of the New York bar.

I could extend this list almost indefinitely. There is scarcely a protected industry in America to-day—or unprotected, for that matter—that has not resorted to combination and to the trust; and for what purpose? For the purpose of destroying home competition. [Applause.] The Government says to the foreigner: "Stand off! You shall not come in competition with our home manufacturers," and as soon as this is accomplished then the home manufacturers combine and destroy all competition; and yet they have the hardihood to come into this house, they have the audacity, when these facts are known to the American people, to stand up here and cry out that we are about to destroy their industries! [Applause.] Whose industries are they destroying? [Applause.] "Don't take the duty off the fleece," say they; but the protected "trusts" seem to be free to "fleece" the public.

Sir, they have not kept faith with the American people, and this bill deals in a spirit of liberality wholly unknown to these protected industries, a liberality which they are unwilling to practice themselves. [Applause.]

It is a fraud and a pretense to claim that labor is getting the benefit of protection. Our tariff laws pour a golden stream into the pockets of the manufacturers, but it never returns to bless and enrich the children of toil.

Mr. Chairman, the strikes which have occurred within the past two years, and particularly those occurring during the past year, establish the melancholy fact beyond question, that capital is master of the situation in this country. Every important strike has failed. The great anthracite coal strike, the railroad strikes, and even the strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the strongest single labor organization within the United States; a strike occurring among a class of workmen where long experience and familiarity with their important and hazardous business was supposed to be necessary—even with this organization the strike is a failure.

It is a lamentable fact that they have been practically driven to the wall. Labor must look to some other remedy, and must look quickly. What labor needs now is protection, not so much from the competition of foreign manufacturers as from the cruel exactions of corporations, syndicates, and trusts. And I mean by labor to include every branch of American industry from the day laborer and wage-worker of the East to that great body of farmers in the West; from the wheat-raiser of the North to the cotton-planter of the South. Here is my analysis of the situation in this country: When the capitalists and the laborers were both without organization capital had greatly the advantage. This has been true in all ages of the world. Now that capitalists and workingmen are both organized, the situation is practically unchanged. Capital still has the advantage. It possesses endurance and ability to stand a siege. Capitalists possess one thing which labor does not—ready money. Labor is in possession of one thing which capital has not—the ballot. My advice to the industrial people of America is to avail themselves of this advantage, and to do it quickly. If labor would remain the servant of capital, pay no heed to what I say. If you wish capital to take its legitimate place as the servant of mankind, if you would avoid serfdom for yourselves and your posterity, you must immediately throw about the people such safeguards as will insure that result. You must erect anew the barriers which our fathers erected, but which have been trodden down.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, the great fundamental principle of our Government is equality—equality of citizens, equality of States—and any tax or law that violates this principle is not in accord with the spirit and genius of our institutions. No government like this, based on such a grand principle, ought to aid private business by tariffs not laid for legitimate taxation; nor has it the right to grant special privileges to some and build up monopolies at the expense of others. This sacred principle was so just, so potent, and so dear to the American heart that it tore, *vi et armis*, from the great charter of our rights all that was in conflict with it.

If, then, Mr. Chairman, the injustice and inequality of slavery could not exist when guarantied and protected by the Constitution because wrong in principle, can protection, which is wrong both in principle and practice, and which means a worse form of slavery to both the black and white of those States where it did exist, live in conflict with it?

The tariff, considered either from the standpoint of protection or for revenue only, is a subject of great difficulty to those who lay it and of much greater concern to those who pay it. The committee and the country have been treated to a very able and exhaustive debate. I am glad we have had it, and it is to be hoped much good will come from it. While I am not one of those who believe that all knowledge of this important question is derived, like Falstaff's knowledge of the real prince, from instinct, but think it should be studied carefully, I do not intend on this occasion to lecture on political economy, nor to harass the committee with long tables. I hope by the use of a few cold facts to point out some of the evils existing in our revenue and currency laws, and to fix the responsibility for such, if possible.

The war is over and the questions arising out of it have been settled. The time has come when every man should speak and vote his honest convictions upon economic questions without reference to the issues of the past. A great responsibility rests upon this House, and particularly this side of it. Let us meet the question with courage and faith in the people. Let us summon all our intelligence, integrity, fairness, forbearance, and patriotism, and in a spirit of mutual concessions agree upon some bill that will reduce the surplus and at the same time lessen the burdens of the tax-ridden people of our country. The Democrat who fails to do his duty in this contest between those who pay and those who receive bounties dishonors the traditions of his party and the sacred trust committed to him.

The bill under consideration is by no means perfect. It is not what I would like to have, but I am prepared to support it as the best that can be had at present. We stand face to face with an increasing surplus of hundreds of millions of dollars. We hear the cry of "hard times" from all classes of people and all kinds of business. While call-loans are cheap and banker's balances are large, people who want money can not get it. The cry comes up for more money, a larger circulating medium. Profits are growing less, values are shrinking. Business men as well as farmers and mechanics find it difficult to make buckle and tongue meet. Mills are running on short time. Traffic is dull, and strikes are on. Pools are made; trusts and combinations of every character are formed to control production and prices. The wealth of the country is passing from the pockets of the many to the coffers of the few. The young men are leaving the country for cities and towns. Such is the condition of the grandest, freest, and best Government, composed of the most intelligent and patriotic people the world ever saw, at a time when it has an outstanding circulation of over $1,600,000,000—more than $25 per capita, and a public credit unequaled by any country at any time.

This is our condition after we have become the greatest manufacturing, mining, and agricultural nation in the world. What is the cause? To my mind there is but one answer, and that is bad financiering and our system of unequal and unnecessary taxation. Our Government has by its own acts taken an overdose of tariff, which threatens financial congestion to the body politic. Some speedy remedy must be applied that will restore to actual circulation the millions now partly held in the Treasury and partly deposited in the national banks and used without interest, and at the same time prevent a repetition of such a condition of business. That such a state of affairs is possible under our form of government is almost incredible, and yet, Mr. Chairman, we know that it does exist, and there is no one bold enough to deny it. It so, let him speak.

The present Administration is in no way responsible for this. It has done all that could be done under the law to prevent it, and has, perhaps, in one or two instances exceeded the power conferred, but it was an honest effort to keep in circulation the money of the people. It called and paid off all of the 3 per cent. bonds that were subject to payment at the option of the Government more than a year ago. Prior to that, in obedience to the known wishes of the President and platform pledges, the Democratic party in this House, under tthe lead of the able, honest, and courageous Morrison, made an effor to reduce the revenues to the actual and necessary expenses of the Government, expecting to absorb the surplus in the payment of such bonds as were subject to call. That was the proper thing to do, and was what the President and nearly all Democrats wanted done, but the Republican party has almost to a man, with a few protectionists on this side, opposed and defeated such measures. But, since the bonds have all been paid there is no way to prevent an increase of the surplus, now too large, without legislative action, except to purchase the unmatured bonds, as the Secretary is now doing.

To prevent any further surplus accumulations in the Treasury bonds are being purchased at a premium of over 26 per cent. For the privilege of paying a coin bond issued for depreciated currency, after paying interest for nearly twenty years, we are required to pay for every dollar thereof $1.26, and the Republican party, whose legislation makes this necessary by a stubborn opposition to the pending bill, declares in effect that this is what it wants. The bondholders are not content with payment according to the contract while we have the money, but insist that we must let the surplus remain idle or pay the premium. Having deliberately adopted a financial policy by which the currency was contracted and the volume in a large measure subjected to the control of the banks, and a large part of the debt funded at high interest for a long time without the option of payment, and having fastened upon the people, under the plea of protection to labor, a system of taxation which requires them to pay indirectly to the manufacturers $3 for every dollar that reaches the Treasury through the custom-houses, the Republican party says to the country that it will consent to no change that will in the least interfere with the profits and tribute of the manufacturing corporations and trusts now sapping the very life of our institutions.

While the favored industries get a tribute of over $500,000,000 annually it will be difficult to get a change until we have a clear majority of Democrats in both ends of the Capitol who will reflect the wishes of the people and respect the Constitution and the common and just principle of equal taxation, according to the wants of the Government. Such legislation, Mr. Chairman, is a crime against humanity and posterity, for which there is nothing that can be said in palliation. For less crimes revolutions have been resorted to and crowned heads brought to the block. For want of a leader bold enough and an organization strong enough to successfully antagonize the corporations and monopolists, who have so long controlled the legislation of the country, the people have been compelled to submit to the wrong; but the President, with the courage of Jackson and the clearness of Jefferson, by his late message, has espoused the cause of the people in the struggle, and has staked the success of his party on the issue tendered by him and accepted by the opposition. Those who are not for him are against him. There is no middle ground in this great fight for reform.

The people, who are nearly always right, are rallying around him. Thousands of voters are changing from opposition to support since his tariff reform message. His party is united as never before, and the result of the next election will determine whether that plain, simple Government, organized by equal citizens, who fled from the op-

pressions and burdens of the Old World in the hope that they could maintain the new institutions at little cost and without injustice, leaving the bulk of the earnings in the pockets of the people, shall be preserved or not. I was glad a short time since to hear the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] express his alarm at the reduction in the value of farm products, and his desire to investigate the cause and correct the wrong, "whether the reduction comes from the tariff law, or whether it comes from the state of the currency." Thae was a patriotic, statesman-like utterance, and I believe that it is the spirit with which we should conduct this discussion. Let us look for the cause and stand ready to apply the remedy in the interest of the whole people.

The currency and the taxes are so often the same thing, and are in so many ways connected, especially when the latter is laid so as to create a surplus, that they may very appropriately be discussed in the same connection, since one object of the pending bill is to reduce that surplus. Without stopping to discuss our present financial policy, I will say that a reduction of taxes and revenue is the first important step in any reform in the currency, and the sooner it is done and the more complete the better for those who wish changes in the currency law. It must be admitted by all who will reflect for a moment, that the actual circulating medium can not be increased, except by the free coinage of silver, until we have reduced the receipts of the Government to less than we spend. As long as our system brings in more than we pay out there is no way to force a circulation of Government currency.

The Government may purchase silver bullion and coin silver or issue Treasury notes or certificates, but it will give but little relief, as it or some other dollars of equal amounts must be kept in the Treasury or used in the purchase of the outstanding bonds. So we see, Mr. Chairman, that the surest way to begin a currency reform is to reduce the tariff and the revenues. Turn into the channels of business what is in the Treasury, and take care hereafter not to exact any more from the people than the Government needs. Let free silver follow the passage of the tariff bill and you will see a return of prosperity. I trust we may have the co-operation of the distinguished gentleman in both of these measures.

Mr. Chairman, but for the vicious legislation of the Republican party since the war our Government would be about out of debt. By contraction of the currency, funding and refunding of the debt, a large part of it has been pushed onto another generation for payment. Without stopping to enumerate at length the financial legislation for which the Republican party is responsible, I charge it with the passage of every bad law that has tended to make times hard and money scarce, and with resisting every act for the relief of the people proposed by the Democrats. In proof of this charge I now call attention to the votes of the two great parties on these financial questions. For the record up to June, 1878, I will read an extract from a speech made by Hon. JOHN E. KENNA, of West Virginia, now a United States Senator from that State:

TAXATION OF THE BONDS.

On the 28th day of June, 1862, the question of concurring in Senate amendments to an act creating bonds, etc., was before the House. Mr. HOLMAN, a Democrat, offered the following provision:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall impair the right of the States to tax the bonds, notes, and other obligations issued under this act."

Sixty-three Democrats voted for this righteous amendment and not one voted against it. Of the Republicans, only 8 voted "ay" and 77 voted "no." Thus the Republican party defeated in the House the proposition to tax the bonds.

THE NATIONAL-BANK SYSTEM.

In February, 1863, the bill was pending for the charter of the national banks. The vote was taken in the Senate on the 12th and in the House on the 20th of that month. The bill involved the inauguration of a system which is as cordially hated by the masses of our people as ever was a measure hostile to their interests. On its passage in the Senate the Democrats voted "ay" 2 and "no" 12, which was six to one against the system. In the House the Democrats voted "ay" 3 and "no" 42, making fourteen to one against it. But who passed this bill and created the national banks? In the Senate the Republicans voted "no" 9, "ay" 21, constituting a majority of more than two to one in its favor. In the House the Republicans voted "no" 22 and "ay" 75, making over three to one in its favor. Thus the Republican party foisted upon the country the national-bank system.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL BANK BILL.

On April 18, 1864, what is known as the supplemental national-bank bill was before Congress. It was a repetition of the evils of the charter act, and was intended to foster and perpetuate the national-bank system. The Democrats voted in the House, 65 solid "no." The Republicans voted "ay" 80 and "no" only 1. In the Senate the Democrats voted, 7 solid "no." The Republicans voted "no" 2 and "ay" 30. Thus the Republican party passed this objectionable act. On the same day, when Mr. Arnold offered in the House a resolution to provide for taxing State banks, Mr. RANDALL, a Democrat, offered to amend by providing for the

TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Notwithstanding that SAMUEL J. RANDALL, who is now Speaker of this House, stands and stood then among the first parliamentarians on the continent, on this resolution to tax national banks, a Republican Speaker, in the interests of the money power, arbitrarily ruled him "out of order." Every member familiar with the history of this body knows how potent is the voice of the Speaker for weal or for woe. On this occasion it was invoked for the defeat of a righteous measure, and thus the Republican party, through its Republican Speaker, denied even a hearing of the cause.

In March, 1869, when the "act to strengthen the public credit," which ought to have been entitled

AN ACT TO SWINDLE THE PEOPLE,

came up for consideration, debate was cut off. Although it declared the currency indebtedness of the country to be payable in coin, and added $500,000,000 to the public debt, it was passed under the "previous question"—the "gag law"—and debate was denied. It was a gigantic fraud. On its passage in the House only 1 Democrat voted "ay," while 34 voted "no." Only 12 Republicans voted "no" and 96 voted "ay." In the Senate the Republicans voted, "no" 7, "ay" 42. The Democrats voted solid "no." While this measure was pending in the Senate, Mr. Thurman, a Democrat, moved to add that—

"Nothing herein contained shall apply to what is commonly called 5-20 bonds."

These bonds were payable in greenbacks, and this act was to make them payable in coin. It was to avoid the consummation of that outrage upon the people that Mr. Thurman offered his amendment. The Democrats voted solid for it. The Republicans voted "ay," only 6, and "no" 31. Thus without amendment, in all its original injustice, the Republican party passed this odious act. On March 29, 1869, Mr. Morgan, a Democrat, offered a resolution to exempt salt, tea, coffee, sugar, matches, and tobacco, and

TO TAX THE BONDS.

This resolution was defeated. The Democrats voted "ay" solid 39; the Republicans voted solid "no," 104. Thus the Republican party in the House, by unanimous vote, again defeated an effort to tax the bonds.

In 1870 the act was pending which provided for funding the greenback bonds into coin bonds, and which

ROBBED THE PEOPLE OF $500,000,000.

The Democrats of the House voted solid "no," 54. The Republicans voted "no" only 2, and "ay" 139! In the Senate the Democrats voted solid "no." The Republicans carried it, and thus the Republican party is responsible for the wrong which resulted from this iniquitous measure; and when the Houses divided and a conference committee was appointed to consider the differences upon this bill, Mr. Brooks arose in his seat and told the Republican Speaker, Mr. Blaine, that the conferees were

"ALL ON ONE SIDE"

and that the minority was not represented. Having "set up" the committee, the Republican Speaker contemptuously replied "it is not essential that it should be." In July, 1870, when SHERMAN'S proposition was pending

TO INCREASE THE NATIONAL-BANK CIRCULATION

$54,000,000, as usual in all these aggressive measures the previous question was demanded and debate refused. While the Democrats voted "ay" only 4, and "no" 44, the Republican party passed this bill. On June 14, when that same bill was pending, Mr. RANDALL, a Democrat, offered a substitute which proposed to take up the national-bank notes, and,

ISSUE $300,000,000 IN GREENBACKS

in their stead. On this measure the Democrats voted "no" only 6, and "ay" 41. The Republicans voted "ay" only 10, and "no" 105. Thus this proposed issue of greenbacks was defeated in the House by the Republican party.

At the same time Mr. Morgan, a Democrat, offered a substitute which provided for

REPEALING THE NATIONAL-BANK ACT.

and the substitution of $400,000,000 in greenbacks, with full legal-tender qualities, for the national-bank notes. The Democrats voted "no" 11, "ay" 34, or over 3 to 1 for the substitute. The Republicans voted "ay" only 3, and "no" 116. Thus the Republican party in the House defeated also this proposed financial reform.

On the 31st of January, 1870, Mr. McNeely, a Democrat, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the national debt should be paid in strict compliance with the contract, whether it is made payable in gold or greenbacks; that the 5.20 bonds are payable in greenbacks or their equivalent, and we condemn the policy of the administration which is squandering millions of money by buying such bonds at a high rate of premium when the Government had the clear right to redeem them at par."

To this honest, fair interpretation of a contract in behalf of a people who were already overcast with the shadow of impending financial panic only 3 Democrats could be found to vote in opposition, while 34 voted in its favor. Of the Republicans only 1 voted for it and 119 members of the Republican party laid it in its grave!

On the 17th day of January, 1870, Mr. McNeeley made

ANOTHER EFFORT IN BEHALF OF GREENBACKS.

He offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and they are hereby, instructed to report at an early day a bill providing for withdrawal from circulation the national-bank currency and for issuing instead of such currency Treasury notes usually known as greenbacks."

On this resolution looking to financial reform the Democrats voted "no" only 2 and "ay" 53. The Republicans voted "ay" 1 and "no" 112. Thus the Republican party in the House slaughtered this further attempt at honest currency.

In 1872, after the policy of the Treasury had been well defined, when the Secretary was day after day

ALLOWING THE BONDHOLDERS TO ROB THE PEOPLE,

by treating the 5.20 bonds as coin bonds and negotiating them in defiance of the contract of their creation, which made them payable in currency, the following resolution was presented:

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this House the Secretary of the Treasury in negotiating the loan authorized by the act of July 14, 1870, has neither increased the bonded debt nor incurred an expenditure contrary to law."

At the time this resolution was offered the policy of the Treasury Department was daily augmenting our national debt. It was daily fastening upon us that system which has since so cursed the country. This resolution gave emphatic approval to this whole ruinous policy, and invited and approved in advance the mischievous course which has since been pursued. It passed the House by a strict party vote. The Democrats voted solid 86 "no." The Republicans voted "ay" 110, and thus the Republican party gave formal and official sanction to a line of policy which has scattered business calamity broadcast over the land.

In 1873 the

ACT DEMONETIZING SILVER

was passed. The country has been made aware of the manner in which this nefarious measure was smuggled and bulldozed through without even being read. Its contents were not known, the yeas and nays were not called on its passage, and hence the vote of members is not entered on the Journal. The RECORD does show, however, that Mr. Hooper, a Republican, moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. He had it in charge. He knew its contents. He knew it struck silver down and destroyed the double standard of our fathers. The RECORD therefore shows that a Republican had charge of the bill, and by a motion to suspend the rules, cut off debate and forced it to a vote. But the RECORD shows more. It shows that this giant swindle had been submitted to the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, the Republican director and controller of finances, and was by him approved. The RECORD on this point is as follows:

"Mr. MERRIAM. Has this bill been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury; and, if so, does it meet his approval?"

"Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. It has been submitted to him, and he not only approves it, but strongly urges its passage."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, this monstrosity, this unmitigated villainy which struck down silver when it was higher in the market than gold, simply to make "money scarce" and increase the burdens of the country, was manipulated and carried through by a Republican member of the House, under the full sanction and support of the Republican Secretary of the Treasury. Passed as the bill was, under suspension of the rules, without debate, and not even read, there is no evidence on earth that any living man knew it demonetized silver except the Secretary and member I have named.

We come now to that

PRINCE OF DESTROYERS,

the resumption act of 1875. Like other similar acts it was passed without debate. Discussion was cut off. The vote in the Senate stood Republican—"ay" 32, "no" only 1. The Democrats voted solid "no." In the House the Republicans voted only 24 "no," and "ay" 136, making more than five to one in favor of this great crime against the prosperity and happiness of the country. The Democrats voted solid 74 to defeat it. In the Senate even Carl Schurz complained that he had "found the bill on his table to-day for the first time, and had not had time to read it or inform himself intelligently of its contents." In answer to this appeal for opportunity to understand this important measure John Sherman, the present Republican Secretary of the Treasury, rose in his place in the Senate and boldly declared that he would "press the bill to its passage from that hour forward." Evidences that he kept that promise faithfully and too well are found in the blasted homes and fortunes and hungry women and children from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the leading financial issues upon which the two great parties have divided. They mark the line between the money sharks on the one side and the people on the other. The Republican party had the President and both branches of Congress during all that time. At the very threshold of the system Mr. Stevens declared to his Republican associates on the floor of the House:

"We are introducing new practices all around. We are making one currency for the people and another for other purposes."

And, sir, that policy was pursued from 1862 to 1875. The Republican party pursued it. With a determined purpose, with unrelenting vigor, with a singleness of object that no human appeal could divert and no human misery deter, the Republican party went madly on in this desperate financial career and never did it call a halt until

CONFRONTED BY A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

in the House of Representatives of the Forty-fourth Congress! It is a part of the financial history of the country, demonstrated by the record, that all the wicked legislation which has racked this country to the very verge of revolution—the whole of it—every act and deed, was consummated when the Republican party had control of every department of the Government. It is also true that not one single act of which the people complain was ever passed after the Democrats acquired control of the House. It is equally true that not one single act of relief was ever enacted until the popular uprising of 1874 gave to the Democrats control of the House of Representatives. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter to be remembered to the everlasting credit of the Democratic party that it encountered and vanquished at the first onslaught the gigantic money power to which the Republican party has been for years as the plaything to a child! The first Democratic House in August, 1876, raised the banner of financial reform by the passage of a bill

TO REPEAL THE RESUMPTION ACT.

The Republican vote on the passage of that bill stood "ay" only 9 and "no" 56, or over six to one against the repeal. The Democrats voted "no" 29 and "ay" 97; more than three to one in its favor. The bill passed the House by Democratic votes, and thus the first battle against the Shylocks was left to be turned against the people by the Republican Senate which failed to pass the bill. There the matter stood when the great political contest of 1876 came on. The result of that election returned a Democratic majority to the House of Representatives, while the Senate is still Republican. Those who have observed the proceedings since we assembled here will bear witness to the earnestness of the warfare that has been waged for financial relief. As early as November 5, 1877, we passed the bill

TO REMONETIZE SILVER.

The Republicans, driven at last by a public sentiment which had twice routed them at the polls, yielded to this measure a fair support. They voted—"no" 24, and "ay" 67; not quite three to one. The Democrats voted—"no" 10, and "ay" 97, or nearly ten to one in its favor. But when this measure to restore the dollar of our fathers was sent by a Democratic House to a Republican Senate it was there amended and emasculated until its value was well-nigh destroyed, and finally vetoed by a Republican President. On the 23d of the same month the

BILL TO REPEAL THE RESUMPTION ACT

passed the House. On this repeal the Republicans voted—"ay" 28 and "no" 92, more than three to one against it. The Democrats voted—"no" 29 and "ay" 104, more than three to one in its favor. This act was sent to the Republican Senate, and there a Rip Van Winkle sleep of seven long months has held it fast.

On the 29th day of April the bill was passed.

FORBIDDING FURTHER RETIREMENT OF GREENBACKS.

The Democrats voted on this measure—"no" 7, and "ay" 104; the Republicans voted—"ay" 73, and "no" 28. Many of them voted with the avowed reason that it would not interfere with the resumption act, and it is equally understood in well-informed circles that the Republicans who favored the bill in the Senate did so upon the same ground. Add to what I have enumerated the bills which have been favorably reported at this session by a Democratic committee, the bill to authorize the issuing of certificates for silver bullion, and the bill to

SUBSTITUTE GREENBACKS FOR BANK NOTES,

and you have a fair epitomized history of the financial legislation of the last sixteen years. In giving the status of the political parties, I have given the result of my own individual researches; I have investigated the subject; I have examined the record, and I speak what I know.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Chairman, in addition to what Mr. KENNA has said I desire to refer to the record of other votes later than the period covered by him, and I will state that I have carefully gone over these votes and believe the analysis I have made is correct. In disposing of the Independents, Nationals, or Greenbackers I have counted them as Democrats or Republicans just as they may have voted on the questions under consideration at the time.

CRAPO EXTENSION BILL.

When this bill was under consideration, Mr. Buckner, a Democrat, moved to fix the time for the payment of the bonds at ten instead or twenty as recommended by the Republican committee, and on a yea-and-nay vote it was lost. The yeas were 91, nays 116. Of the yeas 79 were Democrats and 12 Republicans. Nays, 98 Republicans and 18 Democrats.

Mr. BLAND, a Democrat, and now the able chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, moved a substitute for the committee bill which provided for issuing Treasury notes for bank notes. This would have given the country a better currency without the aid or intervention of the banks, but would have deprived the bank corporations of their power over the currency, and so the substitute was not agreed to, by a vote of 71 yeas to 138 nays. Of the yeas there were 68 Democrats and 3 Republicans; nays, 119 Republicans and 19 Democrats. Afterwards, on the 10th day of July, 1882, the bill passed the House by a vote of 110 yeas and 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 99 Republicans and 11 Democrats; nays, 76 Democrats and 3 Republicans.

LEGAL-TENDER QUALITY OF SILVER DOLLAR.

Mr. Fort, on the 9th of December, 1878, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill declaring the standard silver dollar a legal-tender and preventing any discrimination against it, and failing to get two-thirds it failed by the following vote: Yeas 151, nays 89. Of the yeas there were 106 Democrats and 45 Republicans; nays, 73 Republicans and 16 Democrats.

GREENBACKS RECEIVABLE FOR DUTIES.

Mr. Wood, a Democrat, January 15, 1879, moved to pass a bill making United States notes receivable for duties on imports, and it passed—yeas 153, nays 43. Of the yeas there were 108 Democrats and 46 Republicans; nays, Republicans 31, Democrats 12.

INTERCHANGEABILITY OF GOLD AND SILVER COINS.

On February 3, 1879, Mr. WHITTHORNE, the distinguished and faithful Democrat, who is now chairman of the Committee on Indian Depredations, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to provide for the interchange of gold and silver and to prevent discrimination against either, and it was disagreed to; yeas 101, nays 136. Of the yeas there were 89 Democrats and 12 Republicans; nays 100 Republicans and 36 Democrats.

GREENBACKS AND REFUNDING.

On April 5, 1880, my good Democratic friend General WEAVER, who sits just to my left, moved to suspend the rules and pass the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that all currency, whether metallic or paper, necessary for use and convenience of the people, should be issued and its volume controlled by the Government, and not by or through the bank corporations of the country; and when so issued should be a full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this House that portion of the interest-bearing debt of the United States which shall become redeemable in the year 1881, or prior thereto, being in amount about $782,000,000, should not be refunded beyond the power of the Government to call in said obligations and pay them at any time, but should be paid as rapidly as possible, and according to contract. To enable the Government to meet these obligations the mints of the United States should be operated to their full capacity in the coinage of standard silver dollars and such other coinage as the business interest of the country may require.

This motion was lost by a vote of 85 yeas to 117 nays. Of the yeas there were 84 Democrats and 1 Republican; nays 90 Republicans and 27 Democrats.

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER AND SUSPENSION.

April 8, 1886, when the bill for the free coinage of silver was under consideration the following amendment was offered:

That unless meantime, through concurrent action of the nations of Europe with the United States, silver be remonetized prior to July 1, 1889, that then and thereafter so much of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," as authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver bullion and cause the same to be coined, shall be suspended until further action by Congress.

The amendment was lost by a vote of 84 yeas to 201 nays; of those voting yea there were 52 Republicans and 32 Democrats; nays, 136 Democrats and 65 Republicans.

The bill for free coinage was then rejected by a vote of 126 yeas, nays 163. Of those voting yea there were 101 Democrats and 25 Republicans; nays, 95 Republicans and 68 Democrats. But, Mr. Chairman, this is only a part of one chapter of the legalized crimes of the Republican party against the people. On the financial issues we see that the Democratic party has stood by the people in opposition to all those measures of the Republican party that have brought so much suffering to the poor and so much wealth to the rich.

We see how the record has been made step by step, and see how by degrees the wealth has gone from the masses who create it to the few cunning manipulators of Wall street and tariff barons of New England. The Democratic party has, as is shown by this record, been instrumental in restoring the silver dollar, stopping the further retirement of the greenbacks that the Republicans had said by solemn statute should go; providing for gold and silver certificates; the one and two dollar greenback bills, and during this Congress in passing through the House a bill for fractional currency. There is much in this record to make Domocrats feel proud of their party; but there is still more in the record it has made in the fight for a reduction of tariff taxes and bounties.

And as a second count in the indictment in and for the body of the American people, I charge that the Republican party is not only responsible to the country for the tariff laws as they now exist with all their inequalities and injustice, but that it has on all occasions resisted all reductions that were proposed in the interest of the great body of the consumers, and has supported only such as would relieve the corporations and capitalists; and in order that I may make good this charge, I ask you to go with me to the records that stand as mute but eternal witness against their acts. We can only examine the most important votes on these questions of tariff and internal revenue.

MILLS RESOLUTION.

December 1, 1877, a motion was made by Mr. MILLS, a Democrat, and who is now the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to suspend the rules and pass the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be instructed to revise the tariff so as to make it purely and solely a tariff for revenue and not for protecting one class of citizens by plundering another.

The motion was lost. The yeas were 67, nays 76. Of the yeas there were 60 Democrats and 7 Republicans, and of the nays there were 64 Republicans and 13 Democrats. A vote against this was in effect saying that they would plunder one class of citizens for the benefit of another, or that the protective tariff could not be so arranged as to prevent such plundering.

THE WOOD TARIFF BILL.

This was a bill to reduce taxes proposed by a Democratic committee. On the 5th day of June, 1878, a motion to strike out the enacting clause was agreed to by a vote of 134 yeas, 120 nays. Of the yeas there were 115 Republicans and 19 Democrats; nays, 113 Democrats and 7 Republicans.

FREE QUININE.

On the 30th day of June, 1879, Mr. Covert, a Democrat, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill placing quinine on the free-list, and it was agreed to by a vote of yeas 125, nays 33. Of the yeas there were 103 Democrats and 22 Republicans, and of the nays there were 31 Republicans and 2 Democrats. This bill became a law, Mr. Chairman, but not without the usual protest from the manufacturers, who always keep their weather eye on "the home market," and who are always very much concerned about the consumer if they manufacture what he is compelled to have and can not get anywhere else. Here is the protest they made, and our Republican friends believed it:

Why should objection be made to a duty of 20 per cent.? Why should the chemical industry be singled out to be ruined?

Will the consumer be benefited? We assert most emphatically he will not. Prices will fluctuate; average rates will be as high or higher than they have been during the existence of the protective tariff. But even should the wholesale price be as low as now at times, a consumer using it in small quantities will get no benefit from it. In whose interest, then, is the duty to be reduced?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], who spoke this morning, I believe voted against this bill to save the manufacturing protesters from ruin. If he was so far off in his guess about what would happen to the industries then, what he says now should count for but little, and yet he pretends to know all about it.

In spite of the protests of the manufacturers that it would ruin them, break up their business, and place the people of this country at the mercy of the foreign manufactures, the Democrats passed the bill and took the risk. This was a trial and test of this much-talked of "home-market" idea that we now hear so much about, and it was interesting to see the crash come. If the predictions of our Republican friends had come true then they could have come to us with some standing as prophets, but time has shown that it was all speculation with them. We have more men engaged in this ruined industry now than we had then, and the price of quinine has been reduced from $3.50 per ounce to 50 cents. Nobody is hurt, and if you wish to know who is benefited by this small piece of legislation, ask the millions of people who use this great medicine. In some parts of the country it is almost a necessity.

FREE SALT.

On the 12th January, 1880, Mr. HATCH, a true friend to the farmers, and the present able and faithful chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill for free salt, which was not agreed to; yeas 115, nays 116. Of the yeas there were 104 Democrats and 11 Republicans; nays, 103 Republicans and 13 Democrats.

FREE PAPER AND SALT.

And again on the 14th May, 1880, pending the consideration of a resolution for final adjournment, Mr. MILLS moved to recommit with instructions to report a bill for free printing-paper and free salt before they report the resolution to adjourn, which was disagreed to; yeas 90, nays 116. Of the yeas, 84 were Democrats and 6 Republicans; nays, 94 were Republicans, and 22 were Democrats.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION.

Pending the consideration of this bill on the 6th day of May, 1882, Mr. MILLS, who was then as he is now ready to seize every opportunity to relieve the people, moved to recommit, with the following instructions:

First. That no more money shall be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate that will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Third. That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties, or for imperative reasons the articles may be placed on the list of those free from all duty.

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on all luxuries.

Fifth. That all specific duties should be abolished and "ad valorem" duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

Sixth. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

The motion was disagreed to—yeas 75, nays 152. The yeas were all Democrats; the nays were 130 Republicans and 22 Democrats. Not a single Republican could be found who was willing to say by his vote that taxes should be so imposed as to operate equally throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section. They stood then as they stand now, for class legislation and against equality and justice to all sections. The bill providing for the commission, which was only another means of getting a continuance for the "protected industries," was then passed by the House by a vote of 151 yeas to 83 nays. Of the yeas there were 123 Republicans and 28 Democrats; nays, 75 Democrats and 8 Republicans.

The bill passed the Senate May 9, 1882—yeas 35, nays 19. Of the yeas there were 29 Republicans and 6 Democrats; nays, 17 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

FREE TRACE-CHAINS.

A motion made by Mr. TURNER, a Democrat, and now a member of the Ways and Means Committee, from which the bill now under consideration came, in the House June 6, 1882, to suspend the rules and pass a bill for free trace-chains was lost—yeas 73, nays 109. Of the yeas 70 were Democrats and 3 Republicans; nays, 104 Republicans and 5 Democrats.

KNIT GOODS.

July 3, 1882, on the motion of Mr. KELLEY, a Republican, the rules were suspended and a bill increasing the tariff on woolen knit goods was passed by a vote of 134 yeas to 49 nays. One hundred and twelve Republicans and 22 Democrats voted yea and 47 Democrats and 2 Republicans voted nay. This was done against the earnest protest of Mr. CARLISLE, the present able Speaker.

SHIP MATERIALS.

On July 23, 1887, when the House had under consideration a bill allowing a rebate on materials imported and used in building ships on foreign account, Mr. Tucker, a distinguished and worthy Democrat, moved to so amend as to allow our own citizens to build or purchase ships in our own ship-yards on equal terms with foreigners. The yeas were 95 and the nays 12. Of the yeas there were 75 Democrats and 20 Republicans. The Republicans refused to vote and made the point of no quorum. On a motion to recommit with instructions to so amend the bill the yeas were 84 and nays 96. Of the yeas there were 78 Democrats and 6 Republicans; nays 95 Republicans and 1 Democrat. And yet we are told that this is the American policy. God save us from such Americanism!

THE TARIFF ACT OF 1883.

On the 27th of June, 1882, the bill passed by a vote of 127 yeas, 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 23 Democrats and 104 Republicans; nays, 71 Democrats and 8 Republicans. In the following session, on the 26th day of February, 1883, after amendments in the Senate under a new rule, Mr. KELLEY moved to suspend the rules and take up the bill and Senate amendments, declare a disagreement, and ask a conference thereon; which was agreed to—yeas 147, nays 111. Of the yeas 135 were Republicans, 12 were Democrats; nays, 102 Democrats and 9 Republicans.

The Speaker appointed Messrs. KELLEY, MCKINLEY, Haskell, CARLISLE, and Speer conferees, the Senate conferees being Messrs. MORRILL, SHERMAN, ALDRICH, McDill, and Mahone. On the 3d of March, 1883, the conference report was concurred in by the Senate, and subsequently was agreed to by the House—yeas 152, nays 122. Of the yeas 132 were Republicans and 20 Democrats; nays, 107 Democrats and 17 Republicans.

TARIFF ON WOOL.

April 7, 1884, Mr. Converse moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill restoring the duty on wool as it was prior to the act of March 3, 1883, but it was not agreed to—yeas 119, nays 126. Of the yeas 84 were Republicans and 35 Democrats; nays, 124 were Democrats and 12 Republicans.

MORRISON TARIFF OF 1884.

April 15, 1884, the House being in the committee on revenue bills, and the tariff bill having been reached, Judge KELLEY objected to its consideration. The House, by a vote of 140 yeas to 138 nays, directed the committee to consider it. Of those voting yea, there were 136 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The enacting clause was stricken out by a vote of 159 yeas to 155 nays. Of the yeas, there were 119 Republicans and 40 Democrats; nays, 152 Democrats and 3 Republicans.

THE MORRISON BILL, 1886.

On the 17th of June, 1886, the motion of Mr. Morrison that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the general tariff bill, was rejected by a vote of 140 yeas to 157 nays. Of the yeas, 136 were Democrats and 4 Republicans; nays, 122 were Republicans and 35 Democrats.

Only four of the Republicans of the House would even vote to consider the demands of the people for a reduction of taxes.

INTERNAL REVENUE—HOUSE.

On the 6th day of June, 1878, Mr. Covert, a Democrat, moved an independent section to the internal-revenue bill then under consideration, to reduce the tax on tobacco from 30 and 40 cents per pound to 20, and certain other reductions as to cigars.

Mr. Tucker, another Democrat, moved to amend by making the tax 16 cents per pound, and the amendment was agreed to by a vote of 126 yeas to 80 nays. Of the yeas there were 108 Democrats and 18 Republicans; nays, 73 Republicans, 7 Democrats. The section as thus amended was adopted—yeas 137, nays 103. The yeas were 120 Democrats and 17 Republicans; the nays were 92 Republicans and 11 Democrats.

On the 28th day of June, 1882, the House passed an internal-revenue bill, reported by a Republican committee, to repeal the stamp tax on bank checks, drafts, orders, and vouchers; the tax on capital and deposits of national banks, matches, perfumery, and patent medicines, which yielded an annual revenue of $16,892,880, nearly all of which was paid by the banks, by a vote of 127 yeas to 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 105 Republicans, 22 Democrats; nays, 69 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

In the Senate, on the 19th day of July, 1882, Senator BECK offered an amendment to the bill then pending, to reduce the tax on manufactured tobacco at 12 cents per pound, and it was adopted by a vote of 29 yeas to 26 nays. The yeas were 27 Democrats and 2 Republicans, and the nays were all Republicans.

Senator BECK moved to strike out "perfumery, medicinal preparations, and other articles," and it was lost by a vote of 26 yeas (Democrats) to 29 nays (Republicans).

Senator VANCE moved to amend by retaining the tax on playing cards, and it was lost by 28 yeas (Democrats) to 29 nays (Republicans).

Senator VEST moved to amend so as to allow farmers to sell their tobacco products, but not to peddle, and it was lost by a vote of 23 yeas, Democrats, to 28 nays, Republicans. On the motion of Senator BECK, the following proviso to the bill was adopted by a vote of 24 yeas, Democrats, to 22 nays, Republicans, and 1 Democrat:

Provided, That farmers and producers of tobacco may sell at the place of production tobacco of their own growth and raising, at retail, directly to the consumer, to an amount not exceeding $100 annually.

INCOME TAX.

The Republicans were swift to repeal this tax soon after the close of the war, although there was a national debt of $2,000,000,000 to be paid. This was done about the same time that the cotton-tax on the Southern cotton-planter was increased from 2 to 3 cents a pound. After the Democrats had elected a majority to the House, in May, 1879, Mr. DIBBLE, a Democrat, and now the able and efficient chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to restore this tax.

It required two-thirds to suspend the rules, and so the bill failed by the following vote: Yeas 111, nays 94. Of the yeas there were 105 Democrats and 6 Republicans, and of the nays 84 Republicans and 10 Democrats. And thus the wealth-holders escape the burdens that fairly belong to them. And thus the Republican party refused to correct a wrong that it had done the consumers of the country. There was a long list of items in the internal-tax laws, principally upon capital, but they have all been repealed except one important item, whisky, and it has been reduced from $2 a gallon to 90 cents, and a part of the tobacco tax.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to some extracts from the last report of the late able and distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Manning, which, taken altogether, is to my mind one of the clearest and strongest arguments for a tariff reform that it has been my pleasure to read. It deserves a place as a state paper by the side of the celebrated report of Secretary Walker, as far as it treats of the tariff.

The Clerk read:

THINGS HERE CONSUMED; WITH INLAND AND SEAPORT COLLECTORS OF TAXES.

It is indirect taxes only which the Federal Government now levies, and to which, being thus practically restricted by those provisions of the Constitution, it must look for its revenues, and its remissions when revenue outruns expense. It is out of indirect taxes that arise contentions about protection and free trade, as they arose before the war when our debt was little and our expense so small that many thought Congress might have abolished custom-houses, and no harm.

"Free trade" accurately decribes the internal commerce of our States. It applies to the commerce, one with another, of no other great and sovereign States. It does not apply to our trade with foreign nations. No man now living will ever see "free trade" adopted by these United States in their commerce with foreign nations; for taxes on imports, from the foundation of this Government, have ever been one chief source of Federal revenue, and such they will continue to be.

They are taxes upon consumption, like our internal-revenue taxes; and the true ground of choice among articles suitable for taxation is not the circumstance that they are produced at home or imported from abroad, for neither the producer nor the importer finally pays the tax. The consumer pays it. The place of origin is no criterion. The place of collection is no criterion. The place of consumption is where duties as well as excise are paid at last; seaport taxes and inland taxes are alike in cost of collection (3.3 and 3.6 per cent.) and alike in this, that although the importer and distiller advances the tax, he reimburses himself in the price to the consumer, who alone is taxed.

The true ground of choice is that among all articles thus consumed within our own borders some are better suited for an equitable taxation than others. They are universally consumed, like sugar, or easily identified, like coffee, or their consumption may be safely impeded, like distilled spirits or fermented liquors or tobacco, or they are luxuries, like wines, silks, and diamonds. But of these articles suitable for taxation, foreign production afford as many as home production, or more.

Taxes on imports are levied by all nations. Last year England raised a revenue of $95,978,583 from taxes on imports; France, $38,616,325; Germany, $47,557,160. But no foreign nation taxes raw materials. Such taxes injure home industries, in which those materials are worked up and increased in value by home labor. Such taxes on raw materials, instead of excluding foreign competition from the home market, put our own employers of labor at a great disadvantage in the home market and a greater disadvantage in every foreign market compared with the foreigner employing labor upon untaxed raw materials.

"Protection" is also a misnomer. It implies superiority elsewhere. The superiority over any great industry of ours does not exist upon the globe. It implies infants here and adults elsewhere. Such is not our reputation. It implies that amid competition universal, where the fittest survive, we shall perish. But it is everywhere else believed that whenever we shall release ourselves from bad laws and enter that competition unmanacled, rivals will be distanced, and our primacy established in the markets and commerce of the world.

OUR SUICIDAL TAXES ON RAW MATERIALS.

The total value of our domestic exports for the last fiscal year was almost exactly $666,000,000, of which 86 per cent. were the products of our fields, forests, fisheries, and mines, and 16 per cent. only were the sum total of manufactured products in which American labor was inwrought.

In the last quarter of a century progress in telegraphs, transportation, labor-saving inventions, and the mechanic arts has reduced the profits of capital and the rate of interest by more than one-half; has increased the wages of labor throughout the world; has augmented by at least a third the surplus which our manufacturers can produce beyond domestic needs for sale abroad. Prolonging without necessity our war-tariff taxes on raw materials, we have been undersold and excluded from foreign markets by nations not taxing raw materials.

Despite their low-priced inferior labor, and the high percentage of labor-cost therefore included in their product, our taxed raw materials and their free raw materials have protected the so-called "pauper labor" of Europe against American competition. Our increasing capacity to produce an industrial surplusage has been accompanied by war taxation exactly suited to prevent the sale of that surplusage in foreign markets. Out of our actual abundance this war taxation has forged the instrument of our industrial and commercial mutilation.

Defeating our manufacturers in their endeavor to compete abroad with the manufacturers of untaxed raw materials, it has set them on a ferocious competition at cut-throat prices in our own home market, to which they are shut up, and for which their producing powers are increasingly superabundant. Long periods of glut and so-called overproduction have alternated with brief periods of renewed activity and transient prosperity like the present. These prolonged war-tariff taxes, incompetent and brutal as a scheme of revenue, fatal to the extension of our foreign markets, and disorderly to our domestic trade, have in the last resort acted and reacted with most ruinous injury upon our wage-earners.

As the more numerous part of our population, our wage-earners are of course the first, the last, and the most to be affected by injurious laws. Every Government by true statesmen will watchfully regard their condition and interests. If these are satisfactory, nothing else can be of very momentous importance; but our so-called protective statesmanship has disfavored them altogether. Encumbering with clumsy help a few thousand employers, it has trodden down the millions of wage-earners. It has for twenty-one years denied them.

MORE INCOME FOR WAGE-EARNERS BY DROPPING WORST TAXES.

The taxes to be first remitted are those which prevent or hinder the sale of our surplus products in foreign markets. Their removal will set capital in motion by the promise of better returns, enlarge the steady employment and increase the annual income of many thousand wages-earners, whose prosperity will diffuse prosperity. These taxes are the duties on raw materials, and the most widely injurious of them is the tax upon raw wool.

But the income of all the wage-earners in the United States can be at once enlarged effectively, certainly permanently, by reducing the cost to them of the great necessities of life. Our war-tariff taxes increase needlessly the cost of clothing, shelter, food, to every family. Every wage-earner's expense, every tax-payer's expense, for the clothing of himself and his family is nearly doubled, at least in the Northern, Middle, and Western States, by taxation which can now be remitted, yet leave the Treasury a sufficient revenue.

The duty on raw wool procured for the Treasury last year only $5,126,108. The cost of woolen clothing for our 59,000,000 people was thereby and otherwise enhanced many times more than 90 cents a head, the only cost of our $51,778,948 revenue from sugar. Moreover, any tax on raw wool imported will always make domestic wool-raising a bad business, for in our dry climate some varieties of wool required by the manufacturer are not produced. The tax prevents our manufacturers from competing in foreign markets with all manufacturers who can buy untaxed wool.

The tax prevents our manufacture and export of competing woolens that require the use or admixture of non-American wools, and so restricts the home demand and the growth of the home demand for domestic wool, thus making the export of our domestic woolens impossible, yet involving the enhanced price of foreign and domestic woolens. This petty tax of $5,126,108 on raw wool assists in nearly doubling the actual cost of their clothing to the American people, with no real and no incidental benefit to anybody except the foreign manufacturer.

UNTAX THE CLOTHING OF SIXTY MILLION PEOPLE.

I respectfully recommend to Congress that they confer upon the wage-earners of the United States the boon of untaxed clothing, and in order thereto, the immediate passage of an act simply and solely placing raw wool upon the free-list.

Mr. McRAE. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us examine this question from the farmer's standpoint and see if the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is correct in the theory that he has advanced when he says it is a benefit to them. Until within the last century little improvement was made in agriculture. When the United States declared their independence they stood at the foot of the list of nations in point of agricultural

products; but now they lead the world in this as well as almost everything else, and yet less than 20 per cent. of the total area of the land has been improved.

For many centuries prior to the establishment of our Government there was little or no advancement; no thought had been given to either the preservation or improvement of the soil, and but little improvements had been made in farming implements. There were no planters, reapers, or thrashers in use then. For the latter our ancestors used what Burns called the "the thrasher's waery flingin' tree." No care had been given to the breeding and improvement of stock. It is said that the average size of sheep, hogs, and cattle has more than doubled within the last century, and yet our greatest triumph in this industry in the United States is in the numerical increase, as shown by the estimate of the Commissioner of Agriculture for last year which I now call attention to:

Number and value of farm animals January 1, 1888, *as estimated by the Department of Agriculture.*

Stock.	Number.	Value.
Horses	13,172,936	$946,096,154
Mules	2,191,727	174,853,563
Milch cows	14,856,414	366,252,173
Oxen and other cattle	34,378,363	611,750,520
Sheep	43,544,755	89,279,926
Swine	44,346,525	220,811,082

Quantities of certain agricultural products of the United States, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, for the year 1887, *and for certain products for* 1886.

Corn, 1887	bushels	1,456,161,000
Wheat, 1887	do	456,329,000
Oats, 1887	do	659,618,000
Potatoes, 1887	do	133,000,000
Hay, 1886	tons	41,796,499
Cotton, 1886	bales	6,443,000
Rice (Louisiana*), 1886	pounds	88,000,000
Tobacco, 1886	do	532,537,000
Wool, 1887	do	269,000,000
Butter, 1886	do	960,000,000
Cheese, 1886	do	360,000,000

* About as much more in other States.

J. R. DODGE, *Statistician.*

Now, let us compare the quantity of our grain products with other nations if we wish a clear understanding of them. Here is the showing:

Under grain—	Acres.	Worth.
The United States have	118,000,000	$2,698,000,000
Russia has	158,000,000	1,585,000,000
Germany has	43,000,000	990,000,000
France has	40,000,000	840,000,000

Russia, with 40,000,000 acres more of land in grain, produces but little more than one-half as much in volume as we do. The United States produce about one-third of the cereals of the entire world. This in a large measure is due to the use of improved machinery and farm implements, the absence of any law of primogeniture or entail, and to the fact that the farms are worked largely by the owners, who, while enjoying their freedom, rely upon their own energies and do not look to the Government for aid or bounty. Of the four million farms in the United States in 1880, nearly three million of them were cultivated by their owners, and while the acreage and the number of farms are rapidly increasing, it is gratifying to notice that the average size of the farms has decreased from 203 acres in 1850 to 134 acres in 1880. Our country is secure as long as the lands are divided in small holdings and cultivated by those who own them. At this rate there is little danger of a monopoly of the lands in this country.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to this fact in answer to the statement he made a few moments ago, to the effect that the wealth in the South is in the hands of the few. His statement is not correct as to any part of the South. In my own State, Arkansas, purely agricultural, the average size of the farms was in 1860, 245 acres; in 1870 the average was reduced to 154; while in 1880 it was only 128 acres, less than what the United States gives for a homestead.

The above exhibit of live stock and farm products is a remarkable showing when taken as a whole, but more remarkable when considered with reference to cotton, the growth of ten Southern States. In 1784, or about that time, when a duty was proposed in the United States Congress on the imports of foreign cotton, it was declared by one of the representatives from South Carolina that the cultivation of cotton was in contemplation by the planters of his State and Georgia, and he thought if good seed could be procured it might succeed. The cotton dealers and manufacturers of Liverpool thought it impossible to grow cotton in this country, and yet in the face of these opinions, within less than one century, these ten States have learned to grow enough for sixty millions of our people, and have four millions and a half bales for export, which is largely shipped to England.

When we remember that this vast increase in the yield of the fleecy staple comes from the States so recently laid waste by the war of the rebellion it ought to be sufficient to make all of us proud alike of the traditions of the old South and the pluck and industry of the new. Many of us have but little idea of the desolation that followed peace in this beloved country. The impoverished condition of the South after the war was a few years ago so truthfully and eloquently described by Kentucky's eloquent Representative [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that I shall borrow his language in undertaking to give you some idea of it:

> The poverty of the Southern States at the close of the war was appalling; the desolation beyond description. Every form of accumulated capital had been swept away, every corporate institution hopelessly bankrupt, every State deeply in debt, and the amount of private indebtedness beyond all hope of payment.
>
> A beggared people indeed were they. Fences all gone, work-stock nearly so, fields in briars, many houses burnt, no money, no credit, no provisions, no implements of industry, not even seed for harvest. The negro free; the white adult a paroled soldier or an aged man, frequently a disabled and wounded man; and in many families only widows, orphan maidens, and fatherless children; without political privileges, and with the prospect of a chaotic and harsh period of unstable and doubtful rule; the States without recognized governments, and the relations of the races, of the citizens, and of the States to the Federal Government in grave dispute and doubt. It was indeed a sad and desolate picture.
>
> But all was not lost; far from it. God, the future, and manhood remained, and these contain all the possibilities of success.
>
> There was no alternative left to that people but a stern and resolute struggle for bread, and then for the recovery of political liberty. The war had legislated—it had in a new sense made one the United States; in the destiny of the nation was involved the destiny of every section and all citizens; one country, one flag, one destiny was the fiat of this tribunal, and the future of the South was indissolubly interwoven with that of the Union.
>
> In that Union, under that Government, however modified by the events of those years, must these Southern States work out their restoration. Within the limitations imposed by that Government, and by their actual condition, must they make their recovery. Without repining, with no unmanly cringing, no pretense of repentance or remorse—ay, proud of their dead comrades and conscious of their own rectitude and heroism, they turned their faces to the future, put their trust anew in God, and went to work.
>
> It was a pathetic but glorious spectacle, that conquered and beggared people, amid the ruins of their States and the destruction of their hopes, surrounded by the graves of their beloved slain, and in the depths of poverty, intensely at work for daily bread, and resolutely set on doing the best possible under the circumstances encompassing them. The privations, the suffering, the toil of those slow, sad, harsh years when "the bottom rail was on top," and the whole world seemed to have turned from them, need not now be recalled. Let them pass into history.

And notwithstanding this condition, which was at the time known to all, taxation from that day to this has continued to fasten its fangs closer and tighter on this people. If I will be allowed to quote the language of one of our poets I would say of the tariff as applied to the South that—

> It seats itself upon the sepulchre,
> And of the triumphs of its ghastly foe
> Makes its own nourishment.

Coming back, Mr. Chairman, to the facts and figures, we will find much food for reflection if they are considered in the light of the further fact that there is no prospect that the Old World will either be able to extend her territory or improve to any considerable extent the fertility of her soil. Her population is increasing more rapidly than it has for centuries past. She imports about one-third of her food products at present, and this will continue to increase as the population does. She looks to this country for supplies. Through our wise homestead law our Government is increasing our ability to grow and furnish the products by the improvement of about 10,000,000 acres of land per annum. With our vast undeveloped territory and our excellent land system, under a free form of government, the farmers of America will be able to meet any draft that is likely to be drawn upon them for meat and bread at any time within the next century if they are dealt fairly with in the matter of taxation.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the face of the enormous increase in the quantity of the productions of our farms, it appears from the census reports that the rate of increase in value from 1870 to 1880 was less than 10 per cent., while the important manufacturing States for the same time increased their wealth nearly 200 per cent. The planters in 1860 owned one-half the wealth of the country. They owned in 1880 only one-fourth, and yet the total wealth has nearly doubled in this time. This is not the result of misfortune, accident, drought, or want of economy or industry on the part of the people, because I have shown that they have produced the quantity of products.

The half not invested in farms was increased more than twenty billions in value, while the half owned by farmers only increased four billions. Those not engaged in farming made $5, where those who were made 1, as shown by their investment. As 75 per cent. of all exports from the United States are agricultural products, we can safely assume that the profits of the farmers were made off of those to whom they sold the exports, people of foreign countries, and represented so much money brought into the country. Not so with the manufacturer. Under the present policy of the Government he manufactured for home consumption. The consumers of America bought American goods because they could get no others as a rule.

The manufacturer has become rich, while the consumer, if a farmer, has barely saved what he started with. Does any one find any difficulty in telling whose money made the manufacturer rich? It does not

satisfy the farmer to tell him that the money was kept in our own country when he sees that his reasonable profits have by some sort of legerdemain been lost to him and pocketed by others. The policy of protection has the effect of centralizing the wealth of the country in the hands of the favored few, while it impoverishes the great body of the producers, and makes them dissatisfied. It encourages waste and extravagance on the part of those who are made rich, and has a bad effect upon the people generally.

I am not one of those who would make Congress and the Legislature responsible for all the evils that befall man; neither do I think legislation the remedy for many of the troubles of the present times. I believe that there is such a thing as too much legislation. I sometimes think that we have too many laws and are too much governed. But when, as in this case, if I am correct, the trouble is caused by an existing law, the only remedy is either to modify it or repeal it. That freedom of trade necessary to enable the farmer to get full value for his products is at present too much restricted. We must "turn from this constant introspection to the nations of the earth; down with the walls, out to the sea" if we expect to grow and become a rich and prosperous people.

Mr. Turner, of Kentucky, in the Forty-seventh Congress, gave a very graphic portrayal of the unreasonable details of the tariff as illustrated in the every-day experience of the farmer. I quote the following from his speech:

Here is a statement showing a few of the burdens of the farmer: Under this tariff he rises in the morning, puts on his common flannel shirt taxed 95 per cent.; his coat taxed 57 per cent.; shoes taxed 35 per cent.; and hat taxed 92 per cent.; takes the water from a bucket taxed 35 per cent., and washes his face and hands in a tin bowl taxed 35 per cent.; dries them on a cheap cotton towel taxed 45 per cent.

He sits down to his humble meal and eats from a plate taxed 50 per cent., with knife and fork taxed 35 per cent.; drinks his coffee with sugar taxed 68 per cent., seasons his food with salt taxed 69 per cent., pepper taxed 61 per cent. He looks around on his wife and children, all taxed in the same way; takes a chew of tobacco taxed 199 per cent., or lights a cigar taxed 118 per cent. And, sir, even the sunlight from heaven that pours into his humble dwelling must come through window-glass taxed 59 per cent.; and yet he thinks he lives in the freest government under heaven.

Then he starts to work, puts a bridle taxed 35 per cent. on his horse, and takes his horse that has been shod—the nails used in shoeing being taxed 59 per cent., driven by a hammer taxed 20 per cent.—and hitches him to a plow taxed 45 per cent., with chains taxed 58 per cent.; and after the day's labor is closed and his family are all gathered around he reads a chapter from his Bible taxed 25 per cent., and kneels to God on an humble carpet taxed 51 per cent.; and then he rests his weary limbs on a sheet taxed 45 per cent., and covers himself with a blanket that has paid 104 per cent.

Nor do these grasping manufacturers stop here, but even the broom with which his good wife sweeps the floor is taxed 35 per cent., and the cooking vessels used in preparing her husband's frugal meal are taxed 42 per cent., and the soda used to lighten his bread taxed 59 per cent. She sits down to her sewing with a needle taxed 25 per cent. and a spool of thread taxed 74 per cent., to make a calico dress taxed 58 per cent.; or if she wishes to knit warm socks, to protect her husband and children from the bitter cold, she uses yarn taxed 120 per cent.; and thus daily and hourly must the hard earnings of the laborer go to satisfy the manufacturer and add to his ill-gotten wealth.

In this country a protective tariff means the fostering, by indirect bounties, of mines and manufacturers, and no one else. The consumers who must suffer for this are agriculturists, mechanics, business men, and professional people, who constitute about nine-tenths of our population. The farmers and farm laborers are the principal sufferers. And yet, when their representatives on this floor speak for them, they are told, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] in effect, that farmers have no rights here and no business enterprise, because they have no manufacturing industries. They tell us that we must diversify and stop producing so much.

If the farmers reduce their crops, then to that extent exportation is decreased. Is that what we desire as a nation? Certainly not. The remedy is not in the direction of less work and smaller crops, but in legislation that will give them the right to sell what they raise where they can get the best price, and to purchase what they want and need for the least money, subject to the right of the Government to lay a just and equal tax for the expenses of Government.

We have heard a great deal in this debate about a home market for the farmer. My friend from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] on yesterday very effectually punctured this humbug that the protectionists attempt to palm off on the farmer, but as further illustrating the absurdity of it I make the following quotation from Col. Donn Piatt:

OVERPRODUCTION MEANS UNDERCONSUMPTION.

If for overproduction we read underconsumption we shall be nearer the fact. However, for half a century we have been waiting for two things; one is the time when the infant industries will come of age and be able to stand alone; the other for that home market. We are no nearer either than when we began.

THE SWALLOW OF A HOME MARKET.

Way back in 1848 the writer of this was driven to a little calculation, since widely used, but which is ludicrously unanswerable. A home market means, of course, a consumption of what the farmer and planter have to sell. Very good. Now take from the census the class really protected. From this exclude farmers, merchants, mechanics, laborers, other than of mines and manufactures, and professional people—for they are not protected, nor are they dependent directly or indirectly on mines or manufactures.

Come down strictly to the people in whose behalf the Government interferes. Now select five leading States from the North and South and put to paper their surplus. It will be found that for the protected class to consume that surplus each man, woman, and child will have to eat each day twenty barrels of flour, masticate three hundred bushels of corn, get down twenty hogs, ten beef cattle, chew a hogshead of tobacco, and wear forty suits of woolen and cotton goods. The swallowing capacity of a protectionist is vast, but I hardly think it would accomplish this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this shows, although in a ludicrous manner, the absurdity of the claim that is made by our friends on the other side of this Chamber, that we now have or can ever have a home market sufficient for the sale of our farm products. It will never be unless we take about one-third of our young farmers and organize a large standing army, who will have nothing to do except to consume our surplus products. Such a proposition would hardly get a single vote in this House. The tariff does give the farmer a market in which to buy his manufactured goods at prices made artificially high by reason of it, and in giving even this it restricts him to it. That is all there is in it. The farmer wants no such market, and wants to be protected against such protection.

On another occasion Colonel Piatt in a more serious manner showed that while the tariff did not and could not help but really injured the farmer, it left him to compete with the lowest paid and worst form of labor. Here is what he said:

BUYING UNDER PROTECTION AND SELLING UNDER FREE TRADE.

You see we sell under free trade, and are left to the mercy of the worst form of pauper labor.

What is our condition when we come to purchase? Why, we are met with protection. All that we buy, from a horseshoe to a mower, all that we wear, all that we build for shelter, all that we use over and above our products, from the cradle we are rocked in to the coffin we rot in—the clothes we wear, the shingle that shuts off the storm, the glass we look through, the blanket we sleep under, to the tombstone that records our supposed virtues, are augmented in price to double their value, so that we sell under free trade and buy under protection.

Now, do you wonder that we work at a disadvantage? If protection is such a good thing, we want it; if free trade is such an evil, we don't want it; and yet we have the one and not the other; we get what we don't want and are denied what we do want, and it is the most barefaced, impudent swindle ever perpetrated on an intelligent people. There is precisely where insult is heaped on injury. We are considered so ignorant and stupid that we may be plundered with impunity. [A voice. They'll slip up on that.] I hope so. [A voice. How about wool, colonel?] Let me tell you. They pretend to protect us on wool. Well, we have lost more on our protected shears than we ever made on our protected wool. If the Government will give us free lumber, free salt, cease its protection to the barbed-wire monopoly, and see that I am charged a reasonable rate for transportation on these public highways, called railroads, I will undertake to undersell at a profit any wool grown in any other part of the earth than that of these United States. [Applause.]

What happens to us in Europe? At Liverpool our wheat comes in competition with the wheat of the Baltic, where the laborer works at $18 a year and a goat-skin coat; with the wheat of Egypt, that is to-day the house of bondage, having slavery in its worst form; with the wheat of India, where labor is in as bad a condition; and worse yet, of Australia, where the shipper takes manufactured articles back home in payment—an exchange denied us by law.

And, Mr. Chairman, what he said about wheat may be said as to cotton and live-stock, and these are the principal items of exports from our farms. In fact, they constitute the great bulk of our exports. Our exports of manufactured cotton goods, with high tariff, and our own cotton was less in 1880 than in 1860.

WAGES.

Another fraudulent pretense by which the votes of some laboring men have been secured to the Republican party is the claim that a high tariff makes high wages, when in fact there is absolutely no connection between the tariff and the price of labor. Wages are subject to the law of supply and demand; but, if they were not, and protection did increase them, it would only benefit the few who are engaged in mining and manufacturing, and not the farm hands and mechanics of the South and West.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] have demonstrated very clearly that it does not and can not in any way affect wages. I quote the following from Mr. MILLS on this point:

It is said a high tariff makes high wages for labor. It is said if we reduce the tariff wages must be reduced. How is it high tariff makes high wages for labor? How can it be explained? Why, they say, as a matter of course, if you increase the value of the domestic product, the manufacturer is able to pay higher wages. Unquestionably he is, but does he do it? No. Mr. Jay Gould, with his immense income from his railroad property, is able to pay his bootblack $500 a day, but does he do it? Oh, no; he pays the market price of the street. He gets his boots blacked and pays his nickel like a little man. [Laughter.]

Mr. Vanderbilt, from the income arising from the interest on the immense amount of bonds of the Federal Government he has got, can afford to pay his hostler $10,000 a year. He is able to do it; his bonds enable him to do it, but does he do it? Oh, no; he goes out into the market and employs his labor at the market value, and pays the same price that the humblest citizen in New York does.

High tariff does not regulate wages. Wages are regulated by demand and supply and the capacity of the laborer to do the work for which he is employed. If high tariff regulated wages, how is it the wages in the different States of the Union are different while the tariff is all the same from Maine to California? In every part of the territory of the United States the tariff is the same. How is it the wages are not the same? How is it that wages in the different localities in the different States are different? What is the cause? What is it which disturbs the tariff and prevents it from fixing a high rate of wages all over the country for labor?

My able, eloquent, and genial friend from New York [Mr. COX], in a speech in 1884, proved by official figures from the census of 1880 that the average wages paid by the manufacturing industries were only $1.16 a day for three hundred days in the year, while the average profits of the manufacturer were 36 per cent. of the capital. He also proved, what is still true, that by reason of the tariff the purchasing power of wages was reduced 40 per cent.

Our Republican friends must presume a great deal on the credulity of the farmers of this country when they ask them to accept as true the declarations made here that protection cheapens the price of manufact-

ured goods and at the same time furnishes a ready market for and increases the price of farm products. The farmer at once asks what manner of man can the manufacturer be that he wants to maintain a system that reduces the price of what he manufactures for sale and increases the cost of products he must buy. At the same time they tell the laborers that it enables them to get higher wages. So, in short they ask us to believe that protection gives the farmer a ready market and high prices for what he grows, the consumer of manufactured goods a cheap market for all he wants, and the laborer the highest wages for his work. It would appear from this that protection is a very good thing for everybody except the manufacturer, and yet he is the only one who wants protection. "Oh! what fools we mortals are."

Mr. Chairman, I want some protectionist who asserts that protection increases wages to tell me now and here why it is that the railroads of the country, with no protection, can and do pay on an average higher wages than the protected industries? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] produced receipts to show that laborers in the Edgar Thomson steel works in that State received less than others by the side of these works with no protection. Of course the tariff on iron and steel is the same all over the United States and yet the census shows that the wages in this industry to skilled labor ranged from $1.25 to $4 per day, and that the greatest advancement was made in the sections where the highest wages were paid.

I want some one who is clamoring for protection to our labor against the so-called "pauper labor" of Europe to explain to the country why it is that our imports are principally from Great Britain, where the wages are much higher than any of the other European countries? We import nearly $200,000,000 worth of goods from England and less than one-tenth of that much from Austria, where labor is much cheaper. We need have no fear of the cheap labor. It is the independent, well-paid labor that we must compete with.

If protection is necessary to manufacturing industries, how can England without it export more of manufactured goods than all the balance of the Old World with it? Until these questions are answered I shall not admit that the passage of the pending bill will do anything more than to destroy the monopolies and trusts that have come as the natural outgrowth of protection and a restricted trade. To break these is what I want, above everything else. This bill will injure no industry that naturally and properly belongs with us, and we want no fosterlings.

Frequent reference has been made in this debate to what has been called the free-trade act of 1846, and it has been made to serve both sides. Democrats have ascribed the greatest prosperity to it; Republicans have reversed the inference and charged depression to this and all other periods under low tariff. It will be remembered that England repealed the corn laws that same year. Now let us see how our commerce increased.

Our exports of pork, flour, and corn, to say nothing of cotton, were increased about $30,000,000 worth, and immediately the prices here were almost doubled. The English statistics show that in 1846 there were consumed there per capita only about forty pounds of flour, and that in 1884, the last year that I have been able to get statistics for, this had increased to nearly 200 pounds. In the same time the consumption of other food products that we send her has increased about in the same proportion. This shows what trade between nations does. Why should we be afraid to trade with any nation? In point of physical strength and material greatness we lead them all.

But least of all should we turn from Old England, from whose people we draw our blood and whose language we speak. Linked to her by a submarine cable, we should cultivate the most intimate commercial relations. She wants our products and is bound to have some of them, but will take much more if we will take pay in trade. There is no farmer who does not understand how much easier it is to sell his little produce to his merchant if he will "take it in trade" than to sell for cash. The principle applies to nations as well as individuals.

Mr. Chairman, it was altogether unnecessary for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to trouble himself to show by comparison and boast of the difference in the wealth of his own grand State and the poor but proud Southern States. He might have accepted that as admitted by this side of the House. The important and paramount question with us is how it happens to be so. He says the protective tariff made Pennsylvania rich. We say that protection has kept the South poor. Because it makes one class in one section rich and another class in another section poor is why we oppose it. We know that our people are as industrious and as economical as the people of Pennsylvania, our soil is as fertile.

While we do not ask any aid or bounty, we do ask justice and fair treatment in the matter of taxation. Give us this, and as far as Arkansas is concerned she will challenge Pennsylvania to a nobler rivalry in the contest for future glory. Pass this bill and commence the race on equal terms. Give Arkansas those "unfettered hands" of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] spoke so eloquently, and she will indeed "march to grander industrial triumphs." Since the gentleman has made this unjust comparison, I will make a comparison of the condition of the farmers, and the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, and see what protection does for her own people. Each person engaged in farming there has on an average a capital of $3,637, and the labor of each person so employed with the said sums invested realizes annually $431.

Each person engaged in manufacturing in that State has a capital of $1,250 invested and realizes $719. The Pennsylvania farmer works all the year with an investment of $3,637 for $431. The manufacturer, with a capital of only $1,250, realizes $719. With about one-third of the money he makes twice the profits. As our State is strictly agricultural our people get about the same results. There is nothing in the system except loss to the farmer, locate him where you may.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to say this question is in the politics of this country to stay until a reduction is made. There is no possible way to suppress it. The cry of English free trade, Confederate constitution, Cobden Club, will avail nothing. We have reached a point in our history when the fomenting of sectional strife will not win party victories. About two-thirds of the voters now in the Southern States, as well as elsewhere, had nothing to do with the late war and take but little notice of references to it.

As a representative in part of that element and a native of the South, I will say in this connection to those of our Republican friends who have so frequently applied the epithet "rebels" to our people, that it has no terror for them. They are proud of the South and its history, but are prouder still of our common country, and are interested in making it all that our fathers intended it should be. That people who, like yourselves, were born of rebellion and draw their blood and date their birth from the rebel sires of '76, are not ashamed to be called rebels. It is the nature of Americans to rebel against wrong, and I would remind our protection friends that our first great rebellion was against unjust taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of the question before the House with reluctance and diffidence. The debate has already been so protracted as to weary the House and, perhaps, also the country. There is no possible phase of the subject which has not been presented much better than it is possible for me to present it. Yet, as a member of this body, representing a large and interested constituency, it is meet that I give expression to the reasons which move me to oppose the pending measure.

The people must pay the expense of operating the Government and all the national obligations. For these purposes they are necessarily subjected to taxation. To this no good citizen objects. Good citizens, however, disagree as to methods of imposing that tax.

The policy of the Government from the beginning has been to raise the needed revenues by indirect rather than by direct taxation. Both are admittedly authorized by the Constitution. We have always, and often almost exclusively, employed the indirect system; that is, to raise our revenue chiefly by levying duties upon foreign merchandise. The importer of such merchandise is required to pay such duties at the custom-house. Such duties so collected go into the Treasury to meet the current expenses of the Government and pay our national obligations. Whatever of this burden is borne by the citizen is voluntarily borne. He is at liberty to buy or not to buy any part of such foreign goods. If he does he will bear the burden in whole or in part of the duty paid upon the article he purchases. Such may be the home competition, however, that the burden in whole or in part falls upon the foreign producer and not upon the consumer. To that extent, whatever it may be, the foreign producer is made to share our public burden in return for access to our markets.

Duties may be levied, first, for revenue merely; second, for revenue with incidental protection; third, for revenue and protection.

For revenue merely is to levy them on such foreign products as are not produced in this country at all.

The theory of the advocates of this plan is that a duty levied on such foreign products as are produced here operates to raise the price of the home product by the amount of the duty on the foreign product, and that such increase upon the home product goes into the pockets of the manufacturer; but when levied upon such foreign goods as are not produced here at all, though the cost of the article is increased by the amount of the tax, still the whole of such increased cost paid by the consumer goes into the Treasury.

If levied for revenue with incidental protection a uniform ad valorem duty may be imposed upon all imports sufficient to raise the needed amount of revenue, say 20 per cent., and if this shall operate to aid the development of any home industry, such result is merely incidental, and no part of the purpose for which such duty was levied.

If levied with a view to protection, the duty is imposed upon foreign products sufficient to yield the needed amount of revenue, but is laid upon such foreign goods as are produced at home and with the purpose of placing our own producers upon a plane of equal competition with foreign producers in our own markets.

The advocates of the measure before the House, while declaring that it does not seriously impair the protective system, almost without exception denounce protection as the sum of all villainies, and maintain with great zeal and energy that the highest possible good can only be secured to the people by unrestricted commerce with our sister nations.

We are to conclude, therefore, that the bill approximates that policy as nearly as its authors and advocates found it to be practicable.

If the measure here and there preserves the protective principle, we may reasonably infer that it is a necessary concession to secure the votes of gentlemen who can not safely ignore the industrial interests in their districts. Such are dangerous nurses to be intrusted with infant industries even of their own districts. They are the enemies of protection, but their political life depends upon the concessions referred to.

The zeal, vigor, enthusiasm, ability, sophistry, and eloquence with which all of them assail protection, and the warmth with which they advocate unrestricted trade with all the nations of the earth, make it clear that their ultimate object is free trade.

Free trade repeals all customs laws, closes all custom-houses, and opens our ports to the same freedom of commercial intercourse as now exists among the several States. This means direct taxation to raise the revenues now derived from custom duties. This revenue must then come from taxes levied similar to the method of State taxation for State, municipal, school, and other purposes. About one-fourth would be borne by personal property, and the other three-fourths by real property. The farms and farmers would carry the load. Added to the local taxation the Federal burden would be crushing. The people would not submit to it. The farmers could not endure the oppression.

But the pending measure, subject to such necessary concessions as I have already referred to, is presumably framed with reference to revenue exclusively.

Just who the author of it is does not seem to be of much moment. For the present it is anonymous. It is the pet, though not born of the White House. It is not just the creature the President was yearning for in his message. It is too much of a cross with hated breeds for that; yet it is sent forth as the fetich of the power that reigns at the other end of the avenue. It is to be "honored and obeyed" until one of the full blood shall take its place. "Let it be enthroned" is the "fiat" from the reigning dynasty.

You gentlemen on the other side who do not heed, beware! My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] refuses allegiance, and is pursued with the envenomed fury of offended royalty. "Down with the traitor" comes from the imperial master; "Down with the traitor" echo the organs; and, in the name of civil-service reform, a thousand paid emissaries hunt through the hills and valleys of the old Keystone State, panting for his scalp in their eagerness to hang it upon their master's belt to prove their devotion. [Applause.]

And there is my other friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN]. Oh, rebellious SOWDEN, the Allentown building has gone the way of the disloyal. Look well, my friend; look well to your fortress. Hear you not the organ! Listen:

> The Democratic party has now reached a point where it can not afford to tolerate infidelity to the Democratic creed. And least of all things can it afford to have the Democratic Administration feeding at the public crib men who work in the vineyard of the enemy.
>
> President Cleveland's tariff message is his platform for the Presidential campaign. He is responsible for the fact that loyalty to him and his party is inconsistent with a refusal of loyal support to the pending bill.

And again the organ:

> Monte Cristo Cleveland after the Sowden-Allentown veto. "one."
>
> The others are quite handy, Mr. President—all within easy striking distance—McADOO, FORAN, and all their jolly fellowship. Strike again, Mr. President, and strike hard. McADOO will make a beautiful No. 2.

The whole royal pack are to be turned loose upon the gallant young statesman from New Jersey. Behold his imperial highness as he points the gentlemen from New Jersey to the alternatives: "There is my service; there is the guillotine. Take your choice." [Applause.] May the good Lord shield my young friend.

Was there ever such another petty tyranny? Were ever the powers of the Executive before prostituted to such base purposes? Was ever official patronage so perverted? But pardon the digression.

The revenues for the next fiscal year can be approximately but not accurately estimated. When our people are prosperous they consume more of foreign products; this increases importations and augments the revenues. When there is a general depression among our people they buy less of foreign products; this decreases importations and diminishes the revenues. Hence the revenues will be greater or less according to the degree of prosperity among the people.

It is, however, estimated that the revenues during the next year will exceed the expenditures about $80,000,000. Let it be borne in mind, however, that this estimate contemplates no increase of expenditure for the construction of a navy, no increase of expenditure for coast defense. It is well known that a foreign foe could now put our great seacoast cities under tribute in twelve hours and compel them to hand over to the enemy more money than any foreign war is likely to cost. That estimate does not contemplate any increase in the expenditures for the relief of the country's defenders.

Justice should be done to the men who periled all on the country's battle-fields, and thereby made it possible for the stars and stripes to float over the Capitol. But for them the same flag would long since have been buried in the ruins of the Republic. Even under the present inadequate pension laws the roll is getting larger year by year. For the current year we have been called upon to supply a deficiency of three and one-half millions of dollars.

Robbed of bounties you pledged them by law—robbed by gross misinterpretation of law—they ask for reparation. They ask the equalization of the bounties, a measure absolutely just.

I have, Congress after Congress, introduced such a measure, but it has never found its way back from the committee room.

I have as often introduced a bill to remove the limitation from the arrears act, and although the committee has at least in two recent Congresses and again this session reported the bill back, recommending its passage, the fiat as often went forth that it must die on the Calendar.

Twenty thousand brave men, many of whom fought on nearly every battle-field of the war, have been overtaken by physical and financial misfortunes, some of whom have been obliged to drag their suffering bodies over the hill to the poor-house; others lie suffering in the arms of private charity.

We passed last Congress a bill for their relief. A veto struck it down and hideously illustrated a nation's ingratitude.

Another one is now on the Calendar, offering, not justice, no, but a mean, ungrateful, and niggardly relief. Will you pass it? We shall see.

Beyond all this the time ought to be near at hand when we should provide a general service-pension law.

And still another thing:

Is it proposed to keep the American people forever under the yoke of the bondholder?

In 1891, only three years hence, $230,000,000 of bonds bearing 4½ per cent. interest will be payable. Do you propose to extend them for another series of years, and continue to filch labor to pay coupons?

Only a few years thereafter $730,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds will mature. Is it to be the policy of the Government to put them in process of extinguishment, or shall we extend them indefinitely that the slavery of labor to the bondholder may be interminable.

The national banks, it is true, may perpetuate their circulation by such indefinite extension of the 4½ per cent. bonds payable three years hence, but national-bank circulation is by no means a public necessity. We can easily replace it by the substitution of greenbacks or coin certificates.

What will be the surplus if these great objects are properly provided for? How much can you reduce the revenues if you contemplate just provision for them? Are they not all worthy of patriotic consideration?

Sir, I am utterly opposed to any such sweeping reduction of the revenues as ignores all these important measures. I am unwilling to so wreck the finances of the Government as to make it impossible to discharge that highest of all national obligations—those, legal and equitable, due to the survivors of the war for the Union; and yet that is exactly the effect of the President's policy.

Who is here protesting that our Federal taxation is oppressive? Is labor here on bended knees asking for this legislation? No; it is protesting against it. Do the manufacturers want it? No; under the influence of its menace they see their business languishing. Do the farmers want it? No; they see in it inevitable destruction to a market that has taken up more than nine-tenths of their surplus products. Who does want it? England. Who else? The importers and jobbers. Who else? Wall street, the bondholders, and the national banks. Who else? Those who would degrade American labor, pauperize it and drive its children from the school-house to the mine and the workshop, and make this, like England, a government of classes. Who else? Politicians in search of a slogan to meet a party exigency. [Applause.]

But the President tells us that the accumulated surplus in the Treasury at the end of this fiscal year will reach the sum of $140,000,000; of which sum about $30,000,000 is the surplus of the last fiscal year.

To suffer that to continue is fatal to all the business interests of the country. Such increasing surplus must sooner or later paralyze all sources of employment, drive labor from the workshops to the streets, shrink values, transfer the property of the poor into the hands of the rich, and wreck the nation in a universal panic.

Yet this is the feast which the President has been deliberately preparing for the American people. He deliberately refused to pay out the surplus in the purchase of our bonded obligations, though Congress had provided by law (the act of 1881) ample authority for that purpose. He chose rather to lock it up and withhold it from the channels of business and thereby push the country to the verge of bankruptcy, that the people might be forced to accept escape from impending ruin by his policy of destruction of the protective system, under which we have in a quarter of a century passed every nation on earth in industrial growth and in national and individual prosperity.

Such a daring assault upon the public welfare the President seemed to realize must be made to appear unavoidable. Absence of lawful authority alone could justify him. Hence he tells us that he doubted the sufficiency of the law, because it was in a general appropriation act. The pretext was frivolous.

In all the discussion of the subject in both Houses no lawyer was

found to express such a doubt. All knew there was no room for doubt. If his position was tenable there is no limitation to the arrears-of-pension law; there is no law authorizing the organization of the consular and diplomatic service; there is no law authorizing the organization of the Treasury Department; there is no law authorizing the mails to be carried by the railways; there is no law authorizing unexpended appropriations to be covered into the Treasury; there is no law authorizing 2-cent postage; there is no law authorizing 1-ounce letters to be carried for 2 cents; there is no law authorizing the Interior Department to contract for Indian supplies; there is no law fixing the strength of the Army at 25,000; there is no law fixing the strength of the Navy at 8,250; there is no law to prohibit payment to land-grant railroads of more than 50 per cent. of their earnings from the Government; there is no law for the classification of mail matter and payment of postmasters; there is no law for the existence of the Geological Survey; there is no law for a commission to supervise the selection of juries in the United States courts; there is no law to limit authority to expedite the mail service to prevent a repetition of Star route swindles; and, finally, there is no law authorizing the salary of the President at $50,000 per annum. [Applause.] All these provisions of law are to be found in general appropriation acts.

It will be difficult to recall a more groundless or illogical pretext for so audacious a violation of public duty. But the emergency is upon us. It will not stay the conflagration to discuss whether or not it was the act of an incendiary. It is the duty of patriotism to avert impending dangers. There must be something done to stop this hoarding in the Treasury of the very life-blood of business. There is to be left but one practicable method of relief, and that is by a reduction of revenue. How shall that be done? Shall we take it chiefly off internal taxes, or shall it be taken chiefly off foreign importations in such a way as to seriously impair our manufactures, reduce American wages, and prejudice agriculture?

Such is the alternative. For myself, I find no difficulty in determining where my duty lies. With such an alternative, let the reduction come chiefly from internal taxation. This will afford direct relief alike to agriculture and to manufactures, but chiefly to agriculture. Consumers will realize the full benefit of such a reduction. But it is said the tariff needs revision. So it does; doubtless a careful and proper revision of the tariff would do good. It is likely on some articles it should be lowered and on others raised to bring them upon a plane of equal competition with the foreign products in our own markets.

But a revision by the avowed enemies of protection, a revision that surrenders our markets to the products of the ill-paid labor of Europe, a revision that wipes out as with a sponge the only ample and stable markets for our agriculture, a revision that drives the products of our own labor from our own markets, a revision that closes the workshops of our own country, a revision that degrades our own labor to the pauperized condition of European labor, a revision that would drive all our people to the soil for a living to glut England with our agricultural products at starvation prices, to enable her to feed her labor cheap that she may pay it even less than now—such a revision should be thwarted if possible. [Applause.]

We have the capital, the inventive genius, the improved machinery, the skilled artisans, and the enterprise to successfully compete with any nation on earth if you will but give us protection equal to the difference of the cost of labor in our own country and the cost of European labor. Upon that basis I stand for a revision of the tariff, and if gentlemen on the other side who are in control here would agree to such a revision they would find this side of the House eagerly assisting them. But that is the very thing they do not want. The laboring man and the farmer are blandly assured by these revenue reformers that the protective system is grinding them into dust, and that the "revenue exclusively" panacea will remove all the ills they now suffer and lift them up to a higher plane of prosperity and happiness.

Do not flatter yourselves that farmers are fools or the wagemen ignorant.

Here is a list of prices paid here and in England, for which I am indebted to Mr. BUTTERWORTH, who had it compiled from reliable sources:

	England.	United States.
Book-binders	$6.00	$15.00 to $18.00
Brush-makers	6.00	15.00 to 20.00
Boiler-makers	7.75	16.50
Brick-makers	3.54	11.86
Brick-layers	8.00	21.00
Blacksmiths	6.00	13.30
Butchers	6.00	12.00
Bakers	6.25	12.75
Blast-furnace keepers	10.00	18.00
Blast-furnace fillers	7.50	14.00
Bolt-makers	6.50	16.50
Bolt-cutters	3.00	10.00
Coal-miners	5.88	13.00
Cotton-mill hands	4.60	6.72
Carpenters	7.50	15.00
Coopers	6.00	13.25
Carriage-makers	6.75	13.00 to 25.00
Cutlery	$6.00	$12.00 to 20.00
Chemicals	4.00 to 6.00	13.00 to 16.00
Clock-makers	7.00	18.00
Cabinet-makers	7.00	18.00
Farm hands	3.00	7.50 to 9.00
Glass-blowers	6.00 to 9.00	25.00 to 30.00
Glass (partly skilled)	6.00 to 7.00	12.00 to 15.00
Glass (unskilled)	2.00 to 4.00	7.00 to 10.00
Glove-makers (girls)	2.00	6.00 to 9.00
Glove-makers (men)	4.50	10.00 to 30.00
Hatters	6.00	12.00 to 24.00
Iron-ore miners	5.50	12.00
Iron molders	7.50	15.00
Iron, per ton (finished)	2.00 to 3.00	5.31 to 8.71
Heaters and rollers	10.00 to 12.00	20.00 to 30.00
Instrument-makers	7.00	18.00 to 20.00
Laborers	4.10	8.00
Longshoremen	8.00	15.00
Linen and thread (men)	5.00	7.50
Linen and thread (women)	2.35	5.22
Machinists	8.50	18.00
Masons	8.00	21.00
Printers (1,000 ems)	0.20	0.40
Printers, week hands	6.65	13.40
Pattern-makers	7.50	18.00
Painters	7.50	15.00
Plumbers	8.00	18.00
Plasterers	7.50	21.00
Potters	8.67	18.30
Polishers	7.00	18.00
Paper-makers	5.20	12.00 to 24.00
Puddlers, per week	8.00 to 10.00	18.00 to 20.00
Quarrymen	6.00	12.00 to 15.00
Rope-makers	5.25	9.00 to 12.00
Railroad engineers	10.00	21.00
Railroad firemen	5.00	12.00
Shipbuilding—		
Boiler-makers	7.00	14.00
Machinists	7.00	14.15
Coppersmiths	6.50	16.50
Platers	8.00	18.00
Drillers	6.00	12.00
Riveters	8.00	17.40
Riggers	5.50	11.00
Pattern-makers	8.00	24.00
Salt-makers	6.00	9.00 to 10.50
Silk (men)	5.00	10.00
Silk (women)	2.50	6.00
Scarf-makers	1.50 to 2.25	6.00 to 9.00
Servants (month)	5.00	15.00
Shoe-makers	6.00	12.00
Stationary engineers	7.50	15.00 to 18.00
Soap-makers	5.00	10.50
Tanners	5.00	8.00 to 10.00
Teamsters	5.25	12.00 to 15.00
Upholsterers	8.00	18.00
Watch-makers	8.00	18.00
Wire-drawers	11.00	22.00

Go to any laborer employed in these industries and he will tell you that the industry in which he is engaged, unless protected, must cease to exist in this country unless his wages shall be reduced to those paid in the same industry across the sea. You may hurl your fine-spun theories of political science at him until your head aches and you will fail to convince him to the contrary. He is practical. It is not difficult for him to solve the question of whether his condition as a bookbinder will be better at $18 per week, paying $3.88 for food, than it would be at $6 per week, paying $3.40 per week for food.

It does not require a very high degree of intelligence to comprehend that books bound at a labor cost of $6 per week can drive from the market books bound at a labor cost of $18 per week. It does not require a very large amount of business wisdom to understand that if A is employing ten thousand men in a given industry at $2 per day, and B is employing ten thousand men at $1.25 per day, A will be driven from the market by B and forced to close his establishment, or reduce the wages of his men to $1.25 per day. These men understand very clearly that $1.25 per day reduces them to the level of the employés in the English factory.

The farmer understands how important it is to him to sell food to A's ten thousand men for cash. He further understands that if A closes his establishment his ten thousand employés must go elsewhere for work, and not being able to get it must go to the soil for a living. He understands how in that case he has lost his customers not only, but they have now become his competitors in the production of agriculture. This reasoning of course applies to every manufacturing industry in the country.

Withdraw protection and substitute a tariff for revenue merely, and one of two things is inevitable: either our manufacturers must reduce the wages of their employés to such as are paid by rival establishments in Europe or go out of business.

If the wages are so reduced the American laborer is leveled to the condition of the European laborer. If he is degraded to that level he can no longer educate his children, and soon he will be found wholly unfit for self-government.

Some idea of the industrial condition of Europe will be conveyed by an examination of a late report of Consular Agent Smith touching the

state of labor in the German Empire. After speaking of the unsatisfactory condition of agriculture and many other industries, he says:

In the manufacture of cloth in the district of Potsdam-Frankfort on the Oder there are said to be about 26,000 hands employed, of whom about 14,000 are women, at a weekly wage of 10 to 12 marks ($2.50 to $3), or 260,000 to 300,000 marks ($65,000 to $75,000) for the whole number, or about 15,000,000 marks ($3,750,000) a year, which is four-and-a-half times as much as is paid by the mines to their hands.

Speaking of the wages in the Dresden district, he says:

The inspector for the Dresden district gives the following as the average wages paid in his district, otherwise is not much said about wages, namely:

		Cents.
Hand workmen	per hour	3¾ to 5
Factory operative	do	5 to 7½
Female workers	do	2½ to 3½
Young persons, fourteen to sixteen years old	do	1½ to 2
To a child twelve to fourteen years old	do	½ to 1

At piecework 20 to 25 per cent. more is made.

Speaking of the mines, furnaces, etc., he says:

In the bringing up of iron ore women are used day and night, and principally in tending the windlasses and rolling wheelbarrows. The iron ore is brought to the surface by means of windlasses, to work each of which there are four to six girls, according to the depth of carriage. Where the depth is 20 meters (about 65 feet) four girls in eight-hour turns wind up 80 buckets of iron ore, each of which holds from 1 to 1½ centners of ore (110-165 English pounds). The wages are very low, but the work is preferred by the girls to domestic service, because they are at it but eight hours at a time and can then do as they please. The inspector thinks it is not to be expected that machinery should displace these women, because they are cheaper than machines would be.

In the furnaces and in the iron and steel rolling-mills the regular work of iron forgers is performed only by men. The work done by the women is that of bringing coke, ore, and limestone to the furnaces, pouring water on the glowing coals, and removing the ashes and slag from the puddle-work.

Speaking of the immoral condition that prevails in the factories, he says:

Both men and women use the same wash and dressing rooms and privies in many establishments, but the providing of separate places for the two sexes is increasing, especially in the new buildings. In the old and small establishments much remains to be done, it is said, to remove the dangers to morality to which women are exposed.

The working together of both sexes in rooms where there is a high temperature is said to have a bad effect upon the morals of women. The textile factories come in for a good share of blame in this respect. The Dusseldorf inspector says that the spinning-mills of every branch are bad where there is a mixed employment of the two sexes in the same work-room, and especially those where the time of labor is long, the ventilation poor, the temperature high, and the washing and dressing rooms the same for both sexes; and also similar situated weaving-mills, factories making artificial wool, factories making wearing-apparel, etc. Other inspectors also point to the textile factories.

* * * * * * *

Many sugar-factories are objectionable from moral considerations, in whose hot rooms the women have to wear little clothing and partly bare the body.

Objection is made to chicory and rubber-goods factories on the same ground as to the sugar-factories, that the women work half naked in hot rooms alongside men.

In some factories, where the men and women sleep at night, complaint is made that the halls or rooms are not properly separated from one another.

The inspector for the Potsdam-Frankfort on the Oder district calls attention to the manner in which women are employed in railroad construction. He says they can be seen, with their legs bare and their dresses tucked high up, pushing wheelbarrows in mud and wet sand. Every spring large numbers of farm hands come from the eastern provinces of Prussia to Brandenburg to take part in the harvesting. In summer, after the harvests are over, they have nothing to do, and as they do not like to make the long journey home—for in the autumn they find an abundance of work when the potato and beet-root crops are gathered in—they undertake any labor until the fall crops are ready, and building work is well paid.

Female work in the brick-kilns is objected to, because it is hard, and because the women have to work with their lower limbs bare.

Such is the degradation of this labor. It is so ill-paid as to be brutalized.

We all know that such of those same people as have come among us readily assimilate with ours, and under the elevating and refining influences of our vastly better paid labor rapidly develop into splendid manhood and womanhood. Their children are here sent to the public schools, educated, and frequently well equipped for any condition of American life.

But it is with their brutal and lamentable condition in Germany, as shown by Consul Smith, an officer of this Administration, that American labor must compete if the products of their toil are to be admitted without restrictions to our markets.

The present Commissioner of Labor made an exhaustive investigation in 1883 into the wages paid in Massachusetts and Great Britain in twenty-four industries. Here they are:

1. Agricultural implements.
2. Artisans' tools.
3. Boots and shoes.
4. Brick.
5. Building trades.
6. Carpetings.
7. Carriages and wagons.
8. Clothing.
9. Cotton goods.
10. Flax and jute goods.
11. Food preparations.
12. Furniture.
13. Glass.
14. Hats: Fur, wool, and silk.
15. Hosiery.
16. Liquors: Malt and distilled.
17. Machines and machinery.
18. Metals and metallic goods.
19. Printing and publishing.
20. Printing, dyeing, bleaching, and finishing cotton textiles.
21. Stone.
22. Wooden goods.
23. Woolen goods.
24. Worsted goods.

I quote from his report:

GRAND RESULT.

1. If Massachusetts is credited with the average wages paid and Great Britain is credited with the high wages paid, the Massachusetts wages are higher in twenty-three out of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 48.28.

2. If both Massachusetts and Great Britain are credited with the average wages paid, the wages in Massachusetts are higher in each of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all industries, being 75.94.

3. On an industry basis, the average percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in twenty-three industries, is 65.05.

4. Taking the wages paid per hour as the basis, the average in Massachusetts is higher in each of the twenty-four industries, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 70.88.

5. On the basis of establishment pay-rolls, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts is 97.39.

The percentage that will truly and fairly indicate the higher rate of wages paid in Massachusetts in the industries considered, as compared with the wages paid in the same industries in Great Britain, must be found somewhere between the extremes here given, namely: 48.28 per cent. and 97.39 per cent. The results shown in sections 4 and 5 are not based upon as complete data as those shown in sections 1, 2, and 3, and neither percentage can be fairly used in determining the grand result.

The mean of 48.28 per cent. and 75.94 per cent., as we have previously shown, is 62.11 per cent., and this approximates so closely to the general average, 65.05, as shown in section 3, that we state as the grand result of the comparative weekly wages investigation in Massachusetts and Great Britain for the year 1883, that the general average weekly wage of the employés in twenty-four industries in Massachusetts is 62 + per cent. higher than the general average weekly wages of the employés in the same industries in Great Britain.

Our consul, Mr. Lathrop, made a report, 1884-'85, on labor in English factories. I quote:

The average wages of the men in the Trowbridge woolen factories are estimated at $5.44 per week. The average wages paid to 418 women in one leading factory are given as $2.66 per week, and in another at $3.02 per week. These wages, adds the consul, would not support life unaided; but, generally, these women are the wives or daughters of the male operatives; neither could the male wages alone sustain the average English families, and so the children in their turn contribute to the general fund by also working in the factories. Boys and girls, when employed, earn from $2.25 to $2.40 per week. Thus, to enable a Trowbridge family to live, every member—husband, wife, and children—works in the mills.

Consul Shaw says, speaking of labor in Manchester, England:

American work-people, as a whole, would not live under the conditions in force here among operatives, nor could they be induced to adopt the English system. Here whole families live in the mills and are satisfied to do so. Here the children are compelled to help pay the family expense.

Great numbers of houses visited by me contained each only one living room, and this served as kitchen, dining-room, sitting-room, and in some instances also bed-room. Into some of these small houses large families are crowded, and the manner of life is almost necessarily demoralizing and unfortunate.

Of course our wage-people would never submit to such conditions. They would naturally prefer to engage in agriculture. There they would hope at least to be able to subsist their families and educate their children. What does that mean? It means they no longer buy from the farmer. The farmer has lost this market. This is his home market. This is the market for over 90 per cent. of all he raises to sell. I say it is even worse than that. They not only do not buy any longer of the farmer, but those consumers have themselves now become producers of food products. They are now rivals, competitors, in agriculture. Who shall say that this will not make a glut of agriculture? Will it not change the relation of the supply to the demand? Will not the demand be less and the product greater? Will not the price go down accordingly? Why not? Less consumers and more producers. Well, now, you have destroyed the farmer's home market, a market always sufficient and always stable, where do you supply him other markets?

Let me quote here from the excellent speech of my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]:

Nine million farmers are feeding a nation of 60,000,000 of people. How does this advantage the farmers? The estimated value of the products of our farms, exclusive of cotton and tobacco, is $3,000,000,000 annually, and yet 94 per cent. of this enormous product is taken in our own market and consumed by our own people. The farmers are compelled to export only 6 per cent. of their products. In this connection it is worthy of note that while the value of our manufactures reaches the almost fabulous sum of $7,000,000,000 annually, yet more than 90 per cent. of this is consumed within our borders. It is estimated that the value of our industrial products of farm and factory will aggregate annually $11,000,000,000, and yet nearly $10,000,000,000 of this is disposed of in our own market and consumed by our own people. And yet, with a home market of such absorbing capacity, built up and sustained by a diversification of our industries, the advocates of free trade are constantly holding up the phantom of the markets of the world as the one thing chiefly to be desired.

Of what value to the American farmer are the markets of the world in comparison with his home market? How much of the farmer's surplus products does the world's market require to-day? Before dropping the substance for the shadow it would be well to inquire the extent of the foreign demand for the products of our farm. If a policy is adopted which destroys the home market and forces the American farmers into the markets of the world, when his vessels are laden with the products of his farm, to what ports on the habitable globe will he direct his course? Not to South America, nor Asia, nor Africa, nor Australasia, nor the islands of the sea, for in all these there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and there is no prospect that there ever will be, for these countries are abundantly supplied with agricultural laborers and surplus lands.

Europe is the only country which does not feed its own people, and even there Russia, Germany, Turkey, Roumania, Servia, and Hungary produce their own food supply, and, excluding Germany, furnish a surplus for the European markets. Outside of Great Britain, therefore, there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and with the rich fields of India open to her it is not difficult to discern that the time is not far distant when even this demand will cease.

The chairman of the committee, in his recent speech, declared that—

"We are the great agricultural people of the world, and have been feeding the people of Europe, and must receive European goods in exchange or fail to export our surplus, and thus surfeit the home market and reduce prices."

This hallucination of feeding the people of Europe is easily dispelled. As bread is the main staff of European life, let us see where it is obtained. The population of Europe is about 350,000,000, and the consumption of wheat about 3½ bushels per head, of which scarcely more than half a bushel is required from North and South America, Asia, and Australasia. In three-fourths of the entire area of Europe the consumption does not amount to 2 bushels per head, and

nearly every grain of that is produced at home. On about half the area of Europe there is a surplus to spare to the other half. The largest consumer of wheat in the world, France, was also the largest producer less than fifteen years ago, and has now about as large an area and product as ever, and needs of foreign wheat only about 10 per cent. of her supply.

The 80,000,000 people of Russia live mostly on rye, as do the people of Germany and Central Europe, and produce it all themselves. Many of the people of the North of Europe consume a large proportion of maize. Some in the North of Europe subsist largely on oat-meal. The consumption of all cereals in Europe usually averages at least 16 bushels per head, of which 3 pecks per capita come from other continents. Feeding the people of Europe! Four continents combining to supply a per capita deficiency of 3 pecks per capita in the fifth. A failure of one-half peck in this deficiency sends prices rapidly upward; an excess of one-half peck produces an instant and sudden fall in India and Dakota. An additional half bushel would sprout in the bin or be fed to farm animals without a foreign offer. This is so well known that it would be charity to attribute to ignorance the pretense of enlarging the exportation of wheat by low tariffs, or no tariffs, or by any other device short of the creation of a few million more foreign mouths.

If we do so little in feeding Europe with bread, still less do we supply the meat she consumes. Last year we exported 162,000,000 pounds of beef, fresh and salted 138,000,000, or four-fifths of it, went to Great Britain. Very little is ever wanted elsewhere, and Englishmen are now straining every nerve and spending British gold in enterprises to supply their country with frozen and canned beef from Australia and the Argentines. Of 505,000,000 pounds of bacon, pork, and hams exported, 380,000,000 pounds, or three-fourths of it, went to Great Britain and a part of the remainder to Canada. Scarcely a nation in the world, Great Britain excepted, depends upon foreign nations for its meat supply. It is a necessity of their existence that they should supply themselves. It is the same with cheese, the only other food product of which there is an appreciable deficiency in Europe.

Its market is confined chiefly to Great Britain, and exportation can not be enlarged at all without a reduction in price, and any sudden extension is a practical and physical impossibility. The rich there buy all they can eat now, and the poor all they can afford. The requirement is fixed and limited with the least possible element of elasticity, so that the foreign demand can only fluctuate with the annual variations of the home supply. This statement should dispose of the boastful and silly pretense so glibly and frequently made by free-traders, of feeding Europe, and ought to mark the exit of America in the rôle of the world's nurse and caterer to the universe. [Applause.]

Where then on the face of the globe can the American farmer market his surplus? At home or nowhere. This home market, therefore, should be to him the object of his deepest solicitude and protecting care, for upon it the future of agriculture in this country depends.

Well, what other compensation do you offer the farmer for the loss of his home market? Cheaper goods, you say. Why, a quarter of a century of protection has greatly cheapened everything he has to buy. It has given such energy to our own manufacturers that competition has forced inventions, augmented the skill of our artisans, improved our machinery, and stimulated enterprise, thereby reducing prices of manufactured products. It is this competition that has forced down the price of every foreign product. Destroy our home manufactories and what becomes of this competition? What check have you then upon the greed of the foreign producer who is given a monopoly of our markets? What then will there be to prevent the foreign manufacturer from fixing the price the American farmer shall pay?

The farmer is not only greatly interested in diversified industries supplying the greatest possible number employment outside of agriculture, but also in such labor being well paid. The more the wageman gets for his labor the more he buys from the farmer. A man who gets good wages can and will live well. A man who gets poor wages can buy but little; he must live poor. The man who is out of employment is a wretched customer for the farmer. The free-traders delight in telling wagemen how much cheaper they could live under free trade—that everything they buy would be so much cheaper. Well, in the first place, we have seen that is not so. In the second place, if it is so—if they are thrown out of employment by the destruction of our industries, or if their wages are scaled down to the level of European wages—what will they have to buy with?

Unfortunately there are in our country some conditions that work injustice to all the industries, agriculture as well as manufactures, and labor is the pack-horse that bears the burden. The several States, vieing with each other to secure the investment of capital, have opened wide the door to serious evils. With incorporation laws imposing no restrictions or safeguards against abuses we find our lines of commerce doing business on a basis of from 25 to more than 100 per cent. fictitious or "watered" capital. To this the products of every industry are every second of time paying the same tribute as if it were real. This is a species of intolerable robbery. It is a thief whose hand is constantly filching the pockets of labor. Of all the wrongs to labor this is the greatest and the most wicked. The highest attainment of statesmanship will be achieved by providing a remedy for this monstrous wrong. [Applause.]

Millions of acres of the public domain still remain covered by grants to corporations to which such corporations are not legally, equitably, or morally entitled. This should at once be restored to the public domain. Much good in this direction has already been done, for which the country is more indebted to my friend from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] than to any other member of this body.

Some of the combinations called trusts and pools are daily engaged in open, audacious, and shameless robbery of agriculture and every form of labor.

Elsewhere it has been stated by an eminent and well-informed statesman that the cattle pool of Chicago has in the last five years filched from the people of my State over $40,000,000. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement. Everybody knows that the tariff on cattle and beef has nothing to do with this combination. It is, however, as true that the tariff makes this combination possible as any other. Would you take the tariff off cattle and meat because of the existence of this trust? Would you take the tariff off wheat and flour because we have a combination of millers? That would be absurd. The tariff has just as much to do with these combines as with any other trusts. They exist in England, and will exist here until suppressed by direct legislation.

The one thing that is true, however, is that these various and wicked combinations are bold bandits gorging themselves upon the fruits of hard toil.

If we shall turn our attention to these abuses we shall merit public approbation and give to labor the fullest benefits resulting from judicious protective legislation.

The bill makes its chief assaults upon the farmer, and curiously enough scarcely one of its advocates has failed to pose as the champion of agriculture.

It takes protection from his wools, his flax, and other products he has to sell, puts them on the free-list, and makes dutiable all he has to buy. It cheapens what the farmer has to sell, but not what he has to buy.

As in all history it is difficult to find tyranny, however brutal; slavery, however wicked; crimes, however revolting; oppression, however hideous, that did not exist and were not maintained in the name of liberty, so now agriculture is to be destroyed, manufactures repressed, labor pauperized in the name of the public welfare. [Applause.]

Manufacturers are told that the absence of protection will be more than compensated by cheap labor and cheap raw material. Labor is told there will be an increased demand for it, cheaper food, cheaper clothing, and cheaper shelter for it, and therefore marvelous advantages to it, even if subjected to free and unrestricted competition with the ill-paid and degraded labor of the Old World.

The farmers are told that they will get more for their breadstuffs, because the markets of the world will be opened to them.

How often have the advocates of this measure in this debate told the non-agricultural people that they had to bear the burden of the wool duty; that every woolen fabric they owned cost them the additional burden of the duty on wool and woolens, and before they had passed from the subject turned to the farmers and told them that the removal of duty from wool would create such a universal demand for it as to rapidly advance the price of it in the markets?

From the earliest days of the Republic during forty years the statesmen of this country maintained almost without division the theory of protection. They themselves had framed the Constitution. They themselves in colonial times had experienced the hardship of the industrial oppression of England, and they made provision at the earliest practicable moment to protect the industries of their own country against the industrial aggressions of Europe, and the very first act that was passed under the Constitution declared that one of its objects was the protection of manufactures.

The act of 1816 followed, enlarging the principle of protection. All the leading men of that day advocated it. The act of 1824 went further and enlarged the principle. The act of 1828 followed and enlarged it still further. And up to that time there was no President, there were no leading statesmen in America who antagonized the principle of protection. They stood where we stand to-day. Many of them went to the point of prohibition, especially regarding products essential to a state of war. I could quote pages from Washington, Adams, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and nearly every statesman of that period, squarely advocating the protective system.

Therefore, here to-day, I place the Democracy of the first forty years of the Republic against the Democracy of the last forty years. [Applause.] But after the act of 1828, under the influence of which agriculture in the North flourished as never before, factories sprung into activity with marvelous rapidity, and labor enjoyed universal prosperity, Southern statesmen opened a vindictive war against it for the first time, and this they did in the name of agriculture. What they meant by agriculture was cotton and the slave labor that produced it.

To force American labor into agriculture would make the supply of food products so far exceed the demand as to supply the slaves of the South and the labor of England with the cheapest possible living.

That, they reasoned, would enable them to produce cotton cheaper and would enable the manufacturers in England to pay them more for it.

Thus they could produce cotton cheaper and sell it dearer.

So they demanded that the protection laws be repealed, and declared for nullification and secession unless this demand was complied with.

The North surrendered, and the act of 1833 followed. It closed the work-shops of the North, drove labor from the factory to the farm, pauperized Northern agriculture, and finally resulted in driving the party from power and in the enactment of the tariff law of 1842. This opened the Northern factories again, created a demand for labor that drew heavily from the ranks of the farmers to supply labor for the work-shops, created markets for the products of the soil, and gave to agriculture renewed prosperity. But the tariff-for-revenue party was untiring in the South, and violently aggressive. But the North said, unless you pledge us that you will maintain the tariff act of 1842 you

shall not return to power. The pledge was given; the party was returned to power, and at once tore down the hated protection act of 1842 and passed the free-trade act of 1846.

The destructive tendencies of this act were for a time inoperative under the influence of a foreign war, and our war with Mexico, that diminished the ranks of labor, thereby increasing a demand and opening up new and extensive markets for food products.

The treasures of the California gold mines attracted labor from the farms to the mines, and thus opened another new market for agriculture. Millions from those mines begun pouring into the lap of business, and there was corresponding activity. But when those influences were withdrawn the act of 1846 begun its deadly work.

Still Southern statesmen adhered to the policy of free trade or secession; but stagnation, universal bankruptcy, an ever increasing national debt, an empty Treasury, and broken national credit compelled Mr. Buchanan to ask for a revision of the tariff laws in the interest of revenue and protection.

The act of 1861 followed, and Mr. Buchanan approved it. Secession followed, and a war ensued that cost in money and property destroyed probably not less than ten thousand millions of dollars. Yet under protection during the last quarter of a century we have become first in manufactures, first in agriculture, and first in wealth among all the nations of the earth, with our labor better paid, better fed, better clothed, better sheltered, and better educated than elsewhere on the habitable globe, and yet here we are confronted with the same bold, defiant, and aggressive old revenue-reform party. [Applause.]

God, help us! will the time never come when we shall reach a stable industrial policy? Must our industries and labor be forever exposed to the depressing influence of perpetual menace? Well may agriculture, well may manufactures, well may American labor unite with each other against this ever present, ever aggressive public enemy, and cry out, "Let us have peace!"

These free-traders or revenue reformers, as they fondly call themselves, appear to revel in the adversity of our people. Every calamity is an illustration of the wickedness of protection.

If a farmer imprudently contracts a debt and subsequently is unable to pay it, he is told that he is robbed by protection.

If the crops fail and farmers are depressed thereby, they are told but for this robber agriculture would be prosperous.

If there is something of general business depression, the people are told that old Protection did it.

If some scoundrel has plundered his employés and robbed them of their just share of their own earnings, they are told at once that it is the fault of protection.

If there is a labor strike of 20,000 men because some employer has unjustly discharged and refused to reinstate one of them, the air is vocal with curses upon protection. If some manufacturer has enriched himself by not dealing justly with labor, he is held up as a hideous example of the monopoly-breeding tariff. If a section of our country two hundred years old has been engaged in agriculture and manufactures for more than one hundred years, and has thereby become richer than the new agricultural States of the West, the fact is made to do service as proof that the rich section two hundred years old has been made rich by robbing the new Western States through the agency of the iniquitous tariff.

Why, sir, if we shall be permitted to enjoy continuously for another quarter of a century the benign influence of just protection, my own beautiful prairie State will rival Ohio and Illinois in manufactures, and we shall have the workshop and the farm side by side, and the most prosperous people in the world. Only twenty-seven years ago she was born unto the sisterhood of States. Then she was in population the thirty-third State; now she is the fifteenth. Then she had but ten towns of a population each exceeding 500; now she has over one hundred and fifty towns of over 500 each, nearly a hundred of them of over 1,000 each, and some exceeding 30,000. She has within her borders 1,500,000 souls. The value of her farm crops for the five years ending 1885 was $503,485,316. The value of her live-stock swells from $3,332,450 in 1861 to $117,881,699 in 1885. Then she did not have a mile of railway; now she has over 7,000 miles. She has over seven hundred school-houses, of the value of over $7,000,000. Since then she has expended over $30,000,000 for the support of her common schools. She has three thousand churches, of the value of $3,000,000, and not a whisky saloon within her borders. She has six hundred journals, with a circulation of 500,000. [Applause.]

For these facts I am indebted to an address delivered by the present excellent governor of the State, Hon. John A. Martin, from which I beg to further quote:

A PROPHECY FULFILLED.

On the 7th of May, 1856, a great American, learned, sagacious, and confident in his faith that right and justice would at last prevail, said, in a speech delivered in the city of New York:

"In the year of our Lord 1900 there will be 2,000,000 people in Kansas, with cities like Providence and Worcester—perhaps like Chicago and Cincinnati. She will have more miles of railroad than Maryland, Virginia, and both the Carolinas can now boast. Her land will be worth $20 an acre, and her total wealth will be five hundred millions of money. Six hundred thousand children will learn in her schools. What schools, newspapers, libraries, meeting-houses! Yes, what families of educated, happy, and religious men and women! There will be a song of freedom all around the slave States, and in them slavery itself will die.

Read in the light of the present, these eloquent words of Theodore Parker seem touched with prophetic fire. The ideal Kansas he saw, looking through the mists of the future, is the real Kansas of to-day. The marvelous growth, the splendid prosperity, the potent intellectual and moral energies, and the happy and contented life he predicted, are all around us. At the threshold of the year A. D. 1886, fifteen years before the limit of his prophecy, Kansas has cities like Providence and Worcester; has more than double the railway mileage Maryland, Virginia, and both the Carolinas could then boast; has land worth, not twenty, but fifty and a hundred dollars an acre; has wealth far exceeding $500,000,000; has schools, newspapers, libraries, and churches rivaling those of New England; and has 1,300,000 happy, prosperous, and intelligent people.

The prophecy has been fulfilled, but the end is not yet. The foundations of the State, like those of its capitol, have just been completed. The stately building, crowned with its splendid dome, is yet to be reared. Smiling and opulent fields, busy and prosperous cities and towns are still attracting the intelligent, the enterprising, and the ambitious of every State and country. The limits that bound the progress and development of Kansas can not now be gauged or guessed. We have lands, homes, work, and plenty for millions more; and for another quarter of a century, at least, our State will continue to grow. For we are yet at the threshold and in the dawn of it all. We are just beginning to realize what a great people can accomplish, whom "love of country moveth, example teacheth, company comforteth, emulation quickeneth, and glory exalteth."

[Applause.]

That is the way protection has impoverished the agricultural West. [Applause.] If the good Lord shall give us the rains, the sunshine, and the dew, essential to good crops for the next three years, and our markets are not destroyed by free trade, Kansas will be a barren field for a calamity party.

Had free trade prevailed our growth as a State would have been dwarfed from the beginning. Without a market for our products our surplus would have been used for fuel or rotted on the fields Without the conditions to invite population we would still be in our swadling-clothes.

Her growth is without a parallel in all history. Her magnificent climate, rich soil, splendid farms, myriads of cattle, vast network of railways, busy towns, comfortable homes, her public schools, colleges, churches, charitable institutions, liberal and progressive laws, her enterprising, intelligent, energetic men, beautiful women, and healthful children—all, all combine to illustrate the highest prosperity and the most exalted civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, of all the institutions of learning experience is said to be the most expensive. So it is. But its teachings are of the highest order of wisdom. You may tell the child a thousand times that hot iron will burn, but it is sure nevertheless to make the test, and then we have a wiser child.

You may tell the lad that it is highly imprudent to toy with a mule's hind legs, but he is sure to try the experiment, and then we have a wiser lad.

The people were everywhere told three years ago that, its pledges to the contrary notwithstanding, if they placed the Government in the control of the Democratic party it would marshal all the instrumentalities of power against the industries of the country. They tried the experiment nevertheless, and now we have a wiser people. [Applause.]

The twenty-four years of Republican rule had formed an epoch more fruitful of national and individual prosperity, of agriculture, manufactures and commerce, of the arts and sciences, of education and Christianity, of ideal government and human liberty, than any century of other time since the creation of man.

The generations to come will marvel that in the presence of such a glorious record a people distinguished for their intelligence would wrest the powers of government from such a party and hand them over to another whose history was one of violated pledges and shocking misrule. [Applause.]

Sir, the Republican party stands for industrial independence as a high attribute of national power.

It believes that the destruction of our manufactures will leave our people helpless victims of British greed.

It believes the highest happiness of a people can best be attained by the greatest possible diversity of occupations.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party would have our country independent of all other nations; the workingman own his own home; his table always bountifully supplied with healthful food; his family becomingly clothed; his children educated and equipped for self-government and for every sphere of useful action from the farm to the Presidency. It wishes all nations well; would have peace with the world; but it stands for America and Americans first, last, and forever. [Applause.]

At the conclusion of the foregoing remarks Mr. RYAN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. DALZELL.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has four minutes of his time remaining, which he yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to be used when that gentleman takes the floor in his own right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, it was my ill fortune yesterday afternoon to be absent from the Hall when the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT], whom I regret to find is not in his seat, made his speech. I came into the Hall as he was concluding. I knew that he was speaking upon the need of keeping up our present rate of tariff, and was therefore surprised to hear him engaged in general laudation of Vermont and her

sons, from Ethan Allen down to the heroes of the civil war, and all the distinguished statesmen and jurists that have adorned her history. This was interesting matter, and I should have been in glad agreement with the gentleman had he not ascribed the success and character of the people of Vermont, not to their love of liberty and full enjoyment of free institutions, their means of education and the refinement of society, their invigorating climate, their unrestricted trade with all the States of the Union, and a common possession of the blessings we enjoy under the Constitution, but to the fact that her people are "believers in protection!"

The gentleman also attributed the relative superiority of Vermont to Kentucky to the fact that Kentuckians of this generation do not believe in the doctrine that a people can grow rich from their own taxes.

The gentleman seems to forget that whether Kentucky believes or not she has had the same ratio of taxation and should have the same advantages from it; or is the protection salvation something that depends for its fruition upon faith and not upon works?

The gentleman showed the superiority of the agriculture of Vermont, inasmuch as they raise 14 bushels of wheat to the acre, while in Kentucky they harvest less than 10 bushels; 35 bushels of corn to the acre in Vermont and only 27 bushels bless the toil of the Kentucky farmers; of oats they garner 34 bushels in Vermont and but 20 in Kentucky, and other comparisons favorable to Vermont.

My experience of New England agriculture proves the truth of the statements made by the gentleman from Vermont, but I hold that the results are due to the industry and thrift of the people, their small farms, and intensive methods of cultivation. If the gentleman compares the statistics of Vermont with those of other States that like Vermont are "believers in protection," he will find differences more striking in favor of the mountain Commonwealth.

I have made such comparisons in times past to the same or greater disadvantage of Ohio, Iowa, Illinois, and other States. Sir, there is more in men than in land. I can make the same boasts of Massachusetts, but our agriculture is limited in its scope, and is not improving and advancing as it did in former years; and while I will not go so far as to attribute the unfavorable changes that have taken place gradually since 1860 to the political economy of this generation, I will give some figures from which conclusions may be drawn.

The gentleman from Vermont stated that there had been a constant increase in the value of property in Vermont under the "protective tariff," and he referred to the time previous to 1861 as a free-trade era, as if we had not been under protective tariffs ever since the session of the First Congress. Sir, I will read what the increase in value of farms and products has been in Vermont since 1850 by decades. From 1850 to 1860 the increase of agricultural wealth in Vermont was 44 per cent. That was under what is now called "the free-trade tariff;" from 1860 to 1870, under high tariff, the increase of agricultural wealth was 10.9 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880, and that brings us to the last census which we have to guide us, the increase was less than 4 per cent.

Now, sir, if the State has, as a whole, grown richer, it must have been through her manufacturing, stimulated by the bounties of protection. Let us see. From 1850 to 1860, under the Walker tariff, the per cent. of increase in the manufacturing industries was 90 per cent.; from 1860 to 1870 it was 60 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880 it was but 52 per cent.

Do not the figures show a diminishing volume of prosperity through the whole term of the high tariff, both in agriculture and manufactures?

The sheep husbandry of this fine State, remarkable as its results have been in careful breeding, do not show a relative increase with past times. Will not that husbandry feel the stimulus that is sure to come if wool is placed upon the free-list? I will occupy the remainder of my time in discussing the part of the bill now before the House that relates to wool.

There is a constant and vigorous assertion made several times each day on the other side of this Hall; that if we take the tax off of foreign wools we will destroy our own wool industry. "Destroy" is the word constantly used.

It is asserted that there will not even be sheep enough left from the enforced slaughter to provide mutton for our markets.

Grave protectionists look at us with alarm and declare that unless we "protect" the five or six pounds of wool on the sheep, worth at present prices less than a dollar and half, we will not be able to purchase mutton for money! As sheep can not be raised for wool alone east of the Mississippi and are bred largely for food, the assertion seems paradoxical.

Then there is an equally grave exaggeration in regard to the importance of our wool husbandry. The other day the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] stated that the number of persons dependent on this industry was about 1,200,000.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Not entirely dependent.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. But still dependent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], in his opening speech in this debate, claimed one million of dependent people would be ruined if we did not protect them by a tax that falls directly upon our woolen industry. The resolutions of the Pennsylvania Republican convention double Mr. KELLEY's statement and declare that two millions of people live upon the produce of flocks. No doubt they followed the minority report of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] to the last Congress in which he made a similar declaration. The association of Ohio wool-growers two years ago also claimed that the number of people engaged in this industry reaches two millions.

A little book prepared in this interest, which has been sent to every member of the House, not only makes the same general statements, but goes much farther in the declaration which I will read:

> A majority of these flock-masters, as well as their employed help, are heads of families. Therefore if you add to their number their wives and children, you will have a population of at least 4,000,000 interested in the growing of wool, or about one-fifteenth of the entire population of the United States. There are no doubt fully 150,000 other farmers who keep sheep, but these could not fairly be classed as wool-growers.

This book further says that if the duty is removed from wool it will reduce the wages of 500,000 men employed in herding flocks, and finally sums up the great total of loss as follows:

Shrinkage in the value of lands	$280,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of labor	25,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of flocks	25,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of wool	25,000,000
	355,000,000

As the wool clip is not worth $80,000,000, and as the sheep of the whole country are not worth $100,000,000, the figures and statements are at once seen to be gross and absurd exaggerations. Reduce the number employed and their families and dependent relatives to the lowest number; say that 2,000,000 of people are supported by wool, live by flocks, and spend their time in their care, and how can they be supported?

The highest estimate of the number of sheep in the country in the last year was much less than 50,000,000, but calling it that it requires 25 sheep to support each person with wool worth about $40 for a year's work.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], who does me the honor to listen, made a speech in Boston recently before the Home Market Club, and when some one in the audience said, "We want free wool," he replied, "But what are you going to do with the thousands of men who make a living herding sheep?" I think we ought to find them a better business, for if they were supported for one year by their flocks they would have to use all the wool for clothing, and the mutton for food, so that there would not be a sheep left in the country at the end of a year. If there are any facts in the United States census on which we can rely, there have been the most reckless statements current on the floor of this House in the interest mainly of Ohio wool-growers.

My time is so limited that I can not treat this matter in detail, but I will try to make the point that the prosperity of wool-growing is not dependent upon a tax on imported wool.

The wool-grower is dependent for the sale of his wool upon the manufacturers of his own country alone. Wool is the only one of our farm products of considerable value for which there is no foreign demand.

If there is a surplus it must remain on hand. The manufacturers of other nations are not accustomed to our wools, and will not take them.

Like all other things men wish to sell, its price will be governed by the demand for it; that demand will arise from the prosperity of your customers, and that only. Therefore, if the business of the woolen manufacturers is good you will get a fair price for your wool, but if these men are not successful, if their business is hard and waning, your market grows narrow and wool falls, as we have seen it fall during the last ten years.

The wool-grower and the manufacturer can have no divided interest; they must flourish together or they must languish together, and at this time they are equally unhappy. A gentleman on the other side told me this morning that if I could establish the fact that the wool industry would improve with wool on the free-list he would vote for it.

I do not expect to convince him, though I see him listening. It is too near a Presidential election, and the party whip has a sharp lash. [Laughter.]

How, sir, did we get the blessing of a high tax on imported wool? It was the result of a combination between woolmen and manufacturers.

Prior to 1857 we had a nominal duty on wool, and the fortunate experience of the country in every department of industry and enterprise under the tariff of 1846 led to the further reduction of the tariff in 1857. And, as I had the pleasure to remind the House in the debate the other day, the whole delegation from Massachusetts here and at the other end of the Capitol voted for it. In that revision wool under 20 cents a pound was made free.

The effect upon wool was immediate. It went up, and in 1859 it was as high as it has ever been in our history, and the manufacturers of Massachusetts and Rhode Island made more money than they ever did in any year of their business.

They flourished together, because their interests are identical.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] said, "Continue

this tariff and even raise it and we will produce all the wool required in this country," I saw that he did not understand the relation of wool-growers to manufacturers.

No manufacturing people in our day can raise all its own wool. No soil or climate will produce all the various wools that enter into fabrics ranging from coarse carpets to cloths mixed with silk. The wools grown in America are not a complete raw material even for the cloths for men's ordinary wear. We are controlled by fashion. The manufacturer must make what is demanded. He has to make cloths such as people who pay high prices will buy. In order to get material for such clothing the wool-buyer must go to the world's market and select fleeces to mix and blend with American wool. He may require Australian, or African, or South American, or Spanish, or French wools for his purpose, and if he does he will pay from 50 to 75 per cent. duty on them, and that handicaps him in competition with the men who have free wool; he is thus at a disadvantage with the manufacturers of England, France, Belgium, and Germany, the great cloth-exporting countries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The gentleman speaks only for himself and not for other members of Congress when he says they do not wear domestic goods. The cloth in which I am dressed was made in Maine; the suit was made in Maine. We are not up to the sublimated condition of some gentlemen from Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I hope the establishment that made the gentleman's cloth is prosperous, for there are but few in New England that are so. They are not prosperous because of the tax on their raw material that enables the manufacturers of Europe to send here between forty and fifty million dollars' worth of cloth a year, representing not less than 150,000,000 pounds of wool, which we neither grew, nor sheared, nor wove.

Nor does the gentleman know that his coat is wool at all. Few men in this House have any idea how far substitutes are used for wool. In my district, in the immediate neighborhood where I live, within a radius of 4 or 5 miles from my house, there is turned out a product of about $2,000,000 of woolen cloths—so called. You flatter yourself that they are woolen cloths, and so they are, except so far as cotton is mixed in them; but the wool was worn by previous generations of sheep and may have been worn by two generations of men. These cloths are made from rags, picked to shred and fiber in a shoddy-picker, and then handled like wool. This cloth bears the relation to other cloth that oleomargarine does to butter.

Do you ask what these rags are? They are of all grades, carefully assorted; they are tailor's clippings from fine clothes which make a good "short staple" wool; but in this thrifty age nothing is lost and the shoddy rags come back again. Said one of these manufacturers to me, "I have seen my old shoddy goods come back here time and time again to be picked up and made into new cloth." These shoddies are the woolen cloths boastfully mentioned on the other side of the House that make the cheap suits in which the protected laborer is dressed. Why, sir, the cloth which the gentleman from Maine is wearing may have made a procession down from the really protected magnates of the land and been worn by the commonest beggar shrinking from the sun.

Mr. MILLIKEN. No, sir; this cloth was made in Maine, not in Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. These shoddy clothes are sold cheaply enough perhaps. Men may get their money's worth, for they are sold at prices that would not buy their weight in actual wool.

The American laborer who bears with the farmer the real burden of taxes is not able to buy woolen cloth, but wears the wool that comes from the crop of old clothes. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. They wear more than the European laborers do.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Perhaps they do. Laborers wear what they can get. I do not believe the gentleman knew until now that our laborers do not wear woolen cloth.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Three-fouths of the cloth worn by the laborers of Europe is cotton and not woolen.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. The subject we are discussing is the duty on wool. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am talking about a practical question.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I will so treat it. There are parts of Europe where men may be comfortable in cotton. If so, they do well to wear it. But in this country we have severe winters, with violent changes; the mercury falls to zero, and men who wear the heaviest woolen goods shiver.

Mr. FARQUHAR. After all, Mr. RUSSELL, the average of cloth worn by the laborers in this country is better in every way than is worn by the laborers of Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. And it should be. Now, that the gentleman has got to Europe, let me say something in regard to foreign policy. We are the only civilized country on the earth to-day that imposes a high duty on wool, except poor old-fashioned Spain, and she is an exporter of wools and we are not. England, Belgium, France, and Germany took the duties off of wool years ago.

It is urged here that our people can not keep their flocks without a protection to wool; it is said our sheep will disappear; one will forget the taste of mutton. That is not the teaching of experience here or abroad.

The high-priced lands of England, open to the competition of all mankind, carry more sheep than in former days. The pastures of France have double the sheep they had when wool was protected.

No vote of mine would ever be given consciously against the interest of the American farmer, but I would take the duty off of wool, for I believe that in less than a year the price of wool would advance because the woolen manufacturer, freed from the tax on two-thirds of his raw material, would be better able to buy the other third. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Sir, I have before said that the tariff of 1867 was the result of a combination of manufacturers and wool-men to shear mankind. Like Cæsar Augustus, they decreed that all the world, their world, should be taxed. There should be a prodigious duty on wool and a compensating duty on cloth. It was an abominable agreement. The Treasury did not need the tax, and both of the contemplated beneficiaries were fairly prosperous. The war was over and no revenue change was ever made upon such slight grounds. It brought its own punishment. It was an Ohio idea; but did flocks increase in Ohio under its action, or in any State east of the Mississippi? The census figures show an immediate and heavy decrease in those States. Your tariff proved a hireling shepherd. Within a year wool began to decline and flocks to shrink, and in five years there was a falling off in the number of sheep in the older States of 20 per cent.

They increased heavily west of the Mississippi River from new and unforeseen causes—the opening of free range by the extension of railroads and the disappearance of the Indian and his game from the new Territories.

That was the only part of the country where sheep increased, and that was from advantages that proved to be temporary.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is an incorrect statement that the flocks of Ohio decreased under the act of 1867.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Ohio deny it?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I certainly do.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Then I repeat it with a full responsibility for the statement that between 1867 and 1871 the flocks of Ohio decreased.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And I say that is not true.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. And that they decreased everywhere east of the Mississippi; and the gentleman can look up the facts and contradict and confute me before the House when he has the figures. I speak from recollection, and I will trust my memory in the matter until the figures are quoted. Tariffs can not help wool on high-priced land. A man who keeps sheep on land worth $100 an acre is a good husbandman; but he does not keep sheep for wool. He would keep them if the wool was worth no more than cow-hair or hen-feathers. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I say this from an intimate knowledge of the business, for I am perhaps a larger wool-grower than the average in Ohio. In small flocks the wool product is a by-product.

At the wool conference of last winter, in the very shadow of the Capitol, with this great tariff, the Ohio men said they could not raise wool at 30 cents a pound. They surely can not if that is all the return a sheep makes; but there is a difference between sheep handled by an Ohio farmer and an Ohio politician, and we see that when the Ohio and Kentucky and Tennessee lambs come into Boston market and sell for twice as much as the ewes are worth on the farm with the wool on their backs. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Sheep-keeping in the older States is a matter of "mixed farming," and it will never disappear with or without tariff. It began with the twilight dawn of human history on the plains of Asia, the primal, oldest pursuit of men. If you tax-layers had been in Judea in the days of King Herod you might have made it poorer, but still there would have been shepherds watching their flocks by night to hear and proclaim the glad tidings of great joy—peace and good-will to men. [Applause.] If you could devise protection from sheep-killing dogs you would do more good in your day and generation. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. You had an hour this morning. I listened to you. You made a good speech. I did not interrupt you.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am always pleased to hear Mr. RUSSELL, and that I may be better instructed, I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Very well, go on, but do not make a speech at the same time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I notice the gentleman says he raises sheep not for wool; but is it not possible that he could not raise them for mutton? I take it that the gentleman raises fancy sheep.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I do not like even to make an illustration from my own affairs, but I must reply to the gentleman that my flock is not "fancy." A farmer keeps sheep in "mixed husbandry" for various reasons. His product is lambs, mutton, and wool; it stands in that order. But there is another reason less understood by those not engaged in farming, that is the improvement of land and

restoration of pastures. Sheep make new land, and in that sense we have the old Spanish proverb, "The sheep's foot is shod with gold." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. How many sheep does the gentleman from Massachusetts keep?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I have not seen my flock this spring; and we are constantly changing.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Tell us whether you have twenty-five or thirty.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I said I had more than the Ohio average; we may have twice as many as that average, which is not over fifty.

Now, sir, a word about sheep-raising on cheap lands under protection. I paid much attention to the wool-growers' conference last winter, but I did not see any of you there, and I have here a memorandum of the statement made by Mr. Burbank, of Texas, a flockmaster of the ancient type, who ranges over 35,000 acres of land with 5,000 sheep. Think of it; 7 acres to a sheep—as large as a French farm. He rents the land at 6 cents an acre. He paid four herders $21 a month each, out of which they boarded themselves, and yet Ohio only allows one man to 25 sheep. He found it hard to sell his wool at San Antonio at 14 cents, for, though he allowed $1,300 for lambs, he could not get back his cost at the end of the year.

This was an intelligent, accurate man, well placed; his land could not be much cheaper and he had superior sheep with product of wool above the average. What he wants is a better market for his wool, and that can not be had under the present conditions.

This morning I received letters from the city of Lowell, so beautifully described by my colleague [Mr. ALLEN] in his recent speech, where when the day's work is done the rosy-cheeked factory girl trips from the brightly lighted factory hall, her pockets heavy with her day's wages and seeks her vine-embowered cottage. The news was that the Lowell Carpet Company had suspended operations. Of course the cry was raised that it was owing to the consideration of the tariff, the fear of the passage of the pending bill.

The treasurer of the corporation, in a letter to one of the Lowell papers, denies this. He shows that trade is moribund from various causes, and thinks it would be powerfully relieved by taking the duty off of carpet wools!

Mr. PERKINS and others rose to questions.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I will repeat, that it may be fully understood that it appears that carpets can not be made by this strong, skillfully-managed corporation on account, principally, of the duty on carpet wools. An indefensible tax, no such wools being grown in this country.

All the duty collected on such wool is a direct tax on every yard of carpeting made, and there is no way to evade it.

Mr. PERKINS. I understood the gentleman to say that all the woolen manufacturers at the East had gone into bankruptcy without exception in the last few years.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. You misunderstood me. I have not said so.

Mr. PERKINS. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I have said over and again that the business was not prosperous, and I may say that many large and small manufacturers have become insolvent in the past ten years—some of them not once but two or three times.

Mr. PERKINS. And that was in consequence of this tariff which gives to the wool-grower his protection? I would like to read an extract from the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] answering the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to put one free-trader against another on that proposition. I want to show from the speech the profits of wool manufacturers, and then ask which is correct, free-trader MILLS or free-trader RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I can not yield my little time for such a purpose.

[Mr. PERKINS and others rising in much confusion and many questions.]

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a question of order. We can not hear; there is too much confusion. Let the Chair call the committee to order.

The Chairman rapped to order, but before order could be restored Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, and others made remarks not heard by the Reporter.

Mr. MILLS. This is a violation of our agreement, and I call upon gentlemen on their honor to carry out their agreement.

Mr. BRUMM. Then why do you violate it every time you permit questions to be asked from your side?

Mr. DAVIDSON. But this is not questioning; it is interruption.

Mr. PERKINS. I, of course, recognize the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor, and without his permission I would not interrupt him.

Mr. COWLES. He gave no permission for such interruption.

Mr. REED. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has made an asseveration that our agreement has been violated. As I watched the course of proceedings here I heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] request permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] to ask a question. The gentleman from Massachusetts continued his remarks and then stopped, turning to the gentleman from Kansas, and permitted his question. What violation of agreement was there there?

Mr. MILLS. It was not the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] alone, but half a dozen gentlemen at once, interrupted the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. REED. He consented to it.

Mr. MILLS. He did not consent to the interruption of but one——

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an impression, somewhat shaken by events, that I have the floor; at least I had it. [Laughter.] I think I am more tolerant of interruption than any man in the House, and if my time was not limited I would refuse no gentleman. I yielded to the gentleman from Kansas because he was so persistent that I thought I could get through with him quicker by answering him, but he wished to interject matter into my speech that I think irrelevant, and requested me to reconcile my statement with something another gentleman had said.

Mr. PERKINS. I wanted to know if that gentleman was correct in his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I do not speak for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He is able to take care of himself and answer any gentleman on that side of the House [applause on the Democratic side], and if the gentleman from Kansas wants to debate with him he can get plenty of opportunities.

Mr. PERKINS and others. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I must insist on having part of my time. Gentlemen see that I have no notes and evidently seek merely to break me up and prevent me from getting in my speech.

Mr. PERKINS. I am afraid the gentleman has neither notes nor facts to sustain him.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask if it is right when a gentleman has the floor and is trying to be heard that he should be continually interrupted by questions and noises hurled at him in this way? It is indecent.

The CHAIRMAN rapped to order.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I am willing to return to the questions of the gentleman from Kansas and explain more in detail what I said about the business of woolen manufacturing in Massachusetts. I said in a speech the gentleman perhaps did not hear last month that there were towns in my district whose business was wool manufacturing that had not built a new mill since the tariff of 1846. When mills are burned they are left unrestored, and I made other statements showing the difficulties of the trade.

As a proof of my statement I will quote Mr. Charles A. Beach, of Connecticut, a manufacturer of wide repute and large experience, who testified before the Committee of Ways and Means in the last Congress that the wool manufactories of the United States—not of Massachusetts, not of New England, but of the United States—would not sell for 25 cents on the dollar of their original cost. I speak, and gentlemen can correct me in their own time if I am wrong. One of the largest woolen corporations in the United States has been sold lately. The plant cost something like two millions, and it brought less than $300,000.

Mr. MORSE. Name it.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. It is the Washington.

Mr. ARNOLD. Was not that mill worn out?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. No doubt it was worn out, and so were the stockholders worn out. They had not made money enough to keep up the machinery. I could name other broken corporations and mills that are worn out, and their operatives, too. [Laughter on Democratic side.]

I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ARNOLD] knows what it is to buy woolen mills at bankrupt sales. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I see that my time is just expiring and I will conclude. I would not have trespassed so long upon the time of the committee if the gentlemen on the other side had not been so anxious for information. [Laughter.] I thank the committee for their courtesy.

Mr. FITCH obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH] was to occupy the remainder of the present hour, of which, however, only ten minutes remain. He desires to ask consent to occupy now thirty minutes, twenty minutes of which shall be taken from the end of the next hour.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. This arrangement will not interfere with the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ALLEN], nor with that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH] will proceed. Mr. FITCH (reading):

THE TARIFF.

Unless the tariff men take heed, unless they consent to a rational and considerate adjustment of the tariff such as only can be made by the full light that a careful statistical study of the subject will bring, I fear from them, more than from any other source, a reaction which will bring us by and by into free trade and all its consequences of evil to the manufacturing interests of the country.

I desire to say that, in my judgment, it is not the best mode of defending a tariff to denounce every man who does not pronounce the shibboleth after our fashion as an enemy of the tariff.—*James A. Garfield*, July 13, 1868.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief remarks which I desire to make on the bill under consideration, in the spirit of the words which I have just read, I do not propose to discuss at length the arguments which gentlemen on both sides of the House have already fully presented, nor shall I attempt to review or to put a new meaning into the great mass of customs figures which have been so carefully prepared and explained by the gentlemen who have preceded me. I do not intend to debate the question whether or not we shall have a tariff, or whether that tariff shall be one for protection or not.

I assume that, whether this bill passes or not, we shall continue to have in this country a protective tariff, and that protective tariff, if it be fairly adjusted, if its burdens be distributed with justice so far as interests of my constituents are concerned, I expect to defend and advocate as long as I live. And as long as I live, whenever I find in the tariff laws or in any other of the laws which affect the people whom I represent anything which seems to me in any degree unfair or unjust, I shall not hesitate to advocate their revision and amendment. [Applause.] I propose here to discuss at this time only what seems to me to be the question before the House, whether or not the present tariff and the free-list which accompanies it should remain unchanged during the existence of the Fiftieth Congress.

In the discussion of this question I shall not attempt to imitate the gentlemen who have with such wonderful patience and industry examined the views of the earlier Presidents and the construction of the tariff of 1789, and who have so carefully reviewed the whole course of legislation on this subject since the foundation of the Republic. They have analyzed for you every fluctuation in the prices of our manufactures, and they have accounted satisfactorily for each financial crisis in the history of the country. Every statesman who has in any way identified himself with this question has been quoted by them, and every text-book and essay on the subject has been examined. Each gentleman has found in the same material the most convincing proof that his particular theory was correct and that of his opponent mistaken.

For my part, and with the utmost deference to the learning and ability of gentlemen who have spoken, I am forced to believe that, owing to the changes in transportation, invention of new machinery, the growth and development of the country, and improvements which have accomplished modern civilization here and all over the world, the problem presented to us is entirely different from that considered by the earlier contestants over these questions. It seems to me that no two countries in Europe are to-day more strikingly different in the manner in which their inhabitants live, their means of communication, and their business customs than are the United States of fifty years ago and the country and people whose interests we are considering here.

I desire therefore to leave to other gentlemen who have done it so well the consideration of all the earlier precedents, and to speak only of what the Republican party in our day and generation has promised to do, and to consider what duties are incumbent on us here and now in connection with that promise. I propose also to speak of what I consider to be the interest of the people in my own district, whose condition and whose wants are naturally better known to me than those of others. It can hardly be denied that the present tariff was largely made up in this way: Different interests in special districts sent information and delegations to Washington, urging the enactment of duties specially favorable to them, and sometimes elected Congressmen especially with a view to obtaining a protection which they deemed necessary for their district. It is not probable that the views of the persons represented in this way were always unselfish, and it is possible that the advocates of these particular interests were not unwilling to profit by taxes which bore unequally upon other sections of the country.

It is easy to say, and everybody says in the abstract, that we should legislate for our whole country and not for sections of it, and that this bill should be considered as to its effect on the people at large and not on particular classes. But how has it in fact been considered in this debate? One eloquent gentleman after another has told of the special needs of his district, and has protested solemnly against some proposed interference with the vested rights of his constituents in the present tariff. First of all, and above all, the gentlemen representing the farming interests have been heard. I have read, for instance, with profit, and almost with conviction, the argument of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] for the continuance of the present tariff in all its parts for the protection of the farmers, who, it seems to him, are now insufficiently protected, and with equal interest have studied the seconding appeal of his colleague and my friend, Mr. BREWER, to the same effect. Nothing could have pleased me more than the touching tribute from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] to the virtues of the farming constituency, among which he is fortunate to live, unless it were the kindly offer of my genial and eloquent friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER], the guardian of the American infant, to put a duty of 4 cents per dozen on the fourteen million dozens of eggs which are now imported free of duty, and which we in New York eat and are obliged to pay for in order to protect the American hen and her rural owner against the combined poultry of Europe.

I concede willingly the truth of all that the gentlemen say in the praise of their country constituents. We in New York City have an intimate acquaintance with and a real liking for the New York State farmers, and will never willingly suffer them to be injured by any form of legislation if they will only be fair with us. It seems to us often that they hardly appreciate our friendship. It seems to us that they allow their representatives in the State Legislature to treat us unfairly at Albany. From there, in their wisdom, these representatives regulate our docks and control our street openings; they fix the height of our buildings and the depth of our sewers; they manage the quarantine in our harbor and they arrange the rate of fare on our elevated roads. We are relieved by their kindness from any particular responsibility or trouble about our local tax levy, and they improve, as seems to them necessary from time to time, the charter of our city. Above all, our morals and personal habits and the manner of our observance of the Sabbath are their especial care. [Laughter.]

They study with great personal attention the errors of our metropolis, and they prepare yearly new and elaborate schemes for our reformation. They vote enthusiastic indorsements of home rule in Ireland and explain to us at the same time that New York is hardly fitted to govern itself. We recognize the truth of all the praises which have been bestowed on the farmers in this debate by almost every gentleman who has spoken, but we will never let pass any opportunity to ask them to treat their city neighbors and friends more kindly. And while their interests in this bill are so carefully watched and protected, it is perhaps not unfair that one of us from the city should glance over his district and see if there are no people of whom we can say, as my eloquent friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] said of the farmers, that they are "hard-working, earnest, intelligent, frugal, and moral," and whose interests may deserve some degree of consideration in connection with this bill.

The upper part of the city of New York is mainly a residence district. The majority of the people who live there live on fixed incomes paid them as salaries or wages every month, or by the proceeds of professional employment in which their incomes are limited. Some of them are architects, artists, clergymen, clerks in banks, insurance and law offices, journalists, musicians, lawyers, physicians, teachers, book-keepers, railroad employés, drivers, conductors, policemen, firemen, telegraph and telephone operators, salesmen, mechanical engineers, civil engineers, stenographers, printers, and skilled mechanics of all sorts not employed in industries which have protection under the present tariff.

In that district lives, too, an army of deserving women who earn their living by unprotected labor, and often that of others dependent upon them. There is perhaps a necessity within the course of this long debate that somebody should say a word for these people. The farmer has his eloquent advocate trained in the county and State fairs, who is in arms to defend every product of his ground. The workmen in factories and the manufacturers have their special advocates, who lie awake at night to study their interests and whose voices have been heard here every day since the beginning of this session, asking for one measure or another for their protection. Almost every class has had its advocates here, except perhaps the millionaires, whom nobody will own to represent, and who have no friends in this House.

Suppose, as examples of the class of people to whom I refer in the city of New York, we take the policeman, who guards our houses; the fireman, who will risk his life for our children; the reporter and the printer, who spend the night in preparing our morning papers; the carrier, who brings it through all kinds of weather, and the locomotive engineer on the elevated railroad, who takes us up and down town. These classes of workmen have no direct protection. They are not overpaid, nor is their life more luxurious than it ought to be. The money which they draw at the end of every month is not more than they need, and they are often sorely pinched to buy even the taxed doll to fill the taxed Christmas stocking or to pay for the taxed medicine necessary for any member of the family.

Perhaps an impartial examination may show that these people are as intelligent, as patriotic, and as deserving of consideration in the matter now before the House as are the Rhode Island mill operators or the Kansas farmers. Their wishes and views may be even as important to the Republican party. If you are to get any Republican votes in New York City you must get them from these people. These classes gave you under the wise management of Arthur votes enough to keep down the Democratic majority in the city so that a Republican President was elected by the vote of the State of New York. They gave in my district a Republican an election to Congress, largely because his Democratic opponent refused to support any measure of tariff reform, and voted against the consideration of the Morrison bill.

You can hardly afford to pass these voters over in your desire to conciliate the factory operatives and the farmers, unless, indeed, you have decided to elect your candidate without the vote of New York State. I have had it explained to me that this can easily be done. It is a favorite theory apparently of the same gentlemen who have decided that the city workingmen who gave the most outspoken and determined free-trader in this country, Mr. Henry George, 68,000 votes at an election when we could only get 60,000 for so good a candidate as Theodore Roosevelt, are wild with enthusiasm for the absolute maintenance of the present tariff; and of those other wise leaders of the party whose

declared policy is to alienate the German voters who are still true to the Republican party, in order to please the Prohibitionists, who laugh at their concessions and have always sought and always will seek the downfall of that party.

I for one am not willing to accept such theories or acknowledge such leadership. In the interest of the Republican party, and in the interest of common fairness, I propose to ask gentlemen on this side of the House to consider for a moment how the present tariff, which we have promised to revise, now affects the people whom I have described, and to consider what they pay taxes on in the general distribution of the customs taxes now in force.

They pay upon everything. Look for a moment at what they eat. There is a tariff duty on beef, on pork, hams and bacon, butter and lard, cheese, molasses, grapes, wheat flour, oats, corn meal, rye, barley, potatoes, raisins, vinegar, honey, rice and rice meal, sugar, extract of meat, pickles, currants, apples, salt, and condensed milk. The list is substantially an inventory of the stock of the grocery store at which they buy. There is a duty on the coal which warms them, on their cooking and household utensils, on their entire clothing from their hats to their stockings, on the medicines given them when they are sick, and on the roofs over their heads. What the professional men object to pay is shown by a letter which I will ask to have printed as a part of my remarks:

NEW YORK, *May* 15, 1888.

To Hon. ASHBEL P. FITCH, M. C.:

I beg to address you as a member interested in the revision of the tariff. My plea is in behalf of instruments used in scientific medicine, which is the same as saying that they contribute to the exact information of the profession at large, and are without money profit to the possessor.

I can make you understand me by citing my own case.

For six years I have been pathologist to the New York Foundling Asylum, making *post-mortem* examinations for purposes of study upon the children that die, and recording the findings in detail. I have contributed to the professional stock of exact records nearly 1,500 cases. These are available for all time to the profession for reference.

A complete case for purposes of study consists in a carefully-recorded clinical history, with *post-mortem* findings and microscope examination of the structural charges in the tissues of the organs.

Now, it is the expert work of the pathologist to make the examinations, both gross and microscopic, of the ravages of disease, and it is upon this kind of work that medicine is to advance to the dignity of an exact science.

For my microscope I sent to Jena, where are made the best instruments for my work. At the factory it cost $94; to get it out of the custom-house 40 per cent. more.

Later I sent for an oil emersion lens, and paid $80 at the factory, 40 per cent. more at the custom-house.

Hermann Katsch, of Berlin, makes an instrument called microtome, for cutting infinitely thin sections or shavings from the surface of a piece of an organ of the body, hardened in alcohol. Herr Katsch is the only man in the world who makes this particular variety of the instrument. To prepare a section thin enough for careful study under the high powers of the microscope, this mechanism is necessary. To get this microtome from the custom-house I had to wait two weeks and pay a duty of 40 per cent. on its factory price.

The celebrated Dr. Koch, of Berlin, published a report of the cholera commission, conducted under the auspices of the Government. At most twenty men in this country could require this work, and they must needs pay 25 per cent. duty to get it from the custom-house after paying its publisher's price and freight. What use could this report be to these scientists? To aid them in maturing methods of recognizing the disease when it appeared on ship-board in our harbors; to devise means to suppress it; to protect the country.

It was to the expert work of one such scientist that the city of New York must give its gratitude, that a certain steam-ship just developing cholera among its steerage passengers was detained at quarantine and the city escaped overwhelming infection.

For Koch's report he paid 25 per cent. duty and never received anything from the city or Government.

When we look up from our laboratory tables, microscopes, microtomes, and alcohol—taxed to suffocation—and read in the papers of the United States Treasury filled to suffocation, we reflect that our scientific work takes much time, brings no money return, increases our outgoes, and has not even the encouragement of the Government nor laity.

Respectfully yours,

DR. WILLIAM PERRY NORTHRUP.

Is it unfair to ask for these people a little consideration? Grant that we are to have a protective tariff; must we have this particular one forever?

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE], whose argument against this bill has interested me greatly, said the other day, "Human wisdom has never devised statutes of taxation or methods of industrial development which are not subject to just criticism." I can not put in any better words my conviction that this tariff is a fair subject of discussion. We had lately a Republican President, under whose able and skillful management the Republican party was an important factor in political affairs in New York City, and who gained for us the last victory which our party has had in the city of New York. Few men knew the people of that city of all classes as well as he did. He had been collector at the port of New York and knew well the practical effect of the tariff, and he said in his message:

I recommend an enlargement of the free-list so as to include within it the numerous articles which yield inconsiderable revenue, a simplification of the complex and inconsistent schedule of duties upon certain manufactures, particularly those of cotton, iron, and steel, and a substantial reduction of the duties upon those articles, and upon sugar, molasses, wool, and woolen goods.

On such Republican doctrines as that I am satisfied to rest. On such Republican doctrines as that we can ask for votes in the city of New York from the classes I have spoken of, and we will not then be forced to stand and defend, before people whose monthly wages hardly suffice for their necessary expenses, a tariff which imposes 25 per cent. on India-rubber boots and shoes and 10 per cent. on precious stones. [Applause.]

The commerce of New York, where most of the customs duties are collected, while it asks in vain for the money which is necessary to improve the water ways where $147,000,000 of our revenue is collected every year, pays cheerfully taxes which are used to keep up custom-houses where nothing is ever collected, and to carry the mails on routes which use up the great profits of the city offices, to build harbors in Texas, where a sailor who happened to be stranded would be lost and lonesome, to improve rapids in Tennessee which no one but the lumberman ever sees, and to dredge out creeks in Georgia which the Government engineers who are given charge of the work spend a month in trying to find. Just so the people of the city of New York, sooner than object in any way to the protective tariff, which they believe to be, if properly laid and fairly administered, for the good of the whole country, have paid without objection and cheerfully, on everything they use or touch or handle, from the beginning, these customs duties for the benefit of the manufacturer and his employé and the long-suffering farmer. The time has now come when a revision of the tarift has been promised by both parties, and when the present duties yield so large a revenue that its further accumulation has become admittedly dangerous. Is it strange that at this time and under these circumstances they ask that a readjustment, partially at least, in their interest, may take place? And is it unreasonable to ask that a tariff which puts jewelry at 25 per cent. and oil-cloth for tenement-house floors at 40 per cent. ad valorem; which brings in silver-plated harness at 35 per cent. and children's cotton stockings at 40 per cent.; under which India shawls of the finest quality pay 40 per cent. and common woolen shawls 86 per cent., should be modified? On the theory of protecting or pleasing the manufacturing laborer and the farmer the mass of people in my district in the city of New York have paid for many years, each of them, out of money which they can ill spare, more for their meals, their shelter, their clothes, and their medicines than these things ought to cost them.

The appreciation and kindly feelings which exist towards us in return from the most highly protected manufacturers is shown by the remark in this debate of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. O'NEILL, speaking in opposition to this bill, that "New York is in a large measure a foreign city." It is true, of course, that New York has many foreign-born citizens, and among them are a large number who bear the name of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.] All of us in this country are foreign-born or are the descendants of European immigrants. Whoever speaks deprecatingly of the patriotism of the citizens who came to this country by choice and not by accident throws thereby a doubt on the integrity of that ancestor of his who first took the oath of allegiance to the United States.

I have little regard for the man who contrasts his own patriotism with that of his grandfather, to the disadvantage of the latter. It is true, too, that a visitor from Philadelphia, when he first steps into the busy streets of New York and sees the movement of the commerce of a continent, when he enters first into the life and amusement of a city as interesting as London and as charming as Paris, may easily feel that he has passed a boundary line, and is in another country than his own. [Laughter.] But if the gentleman meant, as he probably did, that New York was a foreign city in the sense of being un-American, he was simply as much mistaken as he would have been if he had said that William Penn was a native American, or that the German settlers in Pennsylvania, and their children, were not as good and patriotic citizens of this country as we are.

Now when we ask of the manufacturers who are represented by our kindly critic, Mr. O'NEILL, a fulfillment of the Republican promise to remedy the admitted irregularities of the tariff, they say that if we touch one article in the present dutiable list, if we add one article to the present free-list the whole protection scheme is in danger. Let me answer them by a quotation again from General Garfield, in the debate on the duty on coal, on March 10, 1871, in this House:

I was surprised at a remark of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. He asserted that there is no item in the whole tariff that can stand alone on its own merits, but that all must be taken in a lump in order to stand. That coal must take salt by the hand, and they, too, must take something else by the hand; and thus all interests unite with all forces before they can make a stand before the country. If this remark be true it strikes a blow at the whole tariff system, a blow I am not willing to strike. I am unwilling to admit that bad taxes must be tied to good ones and thus be kept afloat. I think it unwise to continue this duty on coal, and I am therefore in favor of its repeal.

That, gentlemen, was the view of the last Republican President when a member of this House. I quote him always with peculiar pleasure, for he was one of the Republican candidates who could not only excite great enthusiasm in his own party and among his personal friends, but who could get votes enough from the business people who care little for politics to be elected to office. It seems to me that General Garfield fully answered that objection, but the highly protected manufacturers have endless objections. They seem to think that they are to have a monopoly of objections. We must not ask for cheaper vegetables in the city; the farmer objects. We must not want cheaper clothes; the wool-grower objects. We must not ask for cheaper carpets or household utensils; the manufacturer objects. We must not ask for cheaper coal; the mine-owner objects. We must not claim cheaper sugar or rice; the planter objects.

Well, for one, I for my district of consumers, object to this chorus of objection. We do not own sheep; we can not raise rice or vegetables or sugar; we mine no coal in the Thirteenth district of New York. If every interest in this country which is protected is to come here and cry out at any proposed addition to the free-list or reduction of the tariff taxes, in the interest of the great principle of protection, we, in our turn, shall ask that our monthly wages and the limited incomes on which many of us must live shall have the protection promised us by both political platforms, and that not by and by, but now and in the Fiftieth Congress.

We shall ask this courteously and modestly now. If we are met only by selfish and determined refusals the request will have to be made more emphatically. Certainly we are willing to have a protective tariff, but we do not want an unreasonable and an unchangeable tariff. We want a tariff which shall protect where protection is needed, and a free-list which shall give us the necessaries of life on terms that are at least fair to all.

Gentlemen say that the tariff builds up a home market. Very good. In the residence district of New York City we are the home market; we use our monthly pay the whole year around to buy your goods. Now that you have an opportunity, now that you can afford it, now that you have promised it, be fair to your home market. Show us by timely and reasonable concessions that you are not entirely selfish, and we will, as we have heretofore, go on cheerfully paying more for every thing which we use than we think the goods ought to cost us.

The answer to this seemingly reasonable demand on our side of the House seems to be this in substance: It is true that the tariff ought to be revised. The party platform promised it; the last Republican President and his Secretaries advised it; the party conventions in many States have agreed to it; but it must be done only by the Republican party in a House of which that party shall have a majority.

There are two objections to this answer:

First. It is a postponement, an indefinite postponement of something which was promised four years ago, and ought to have been done before now. Whatever hopes gentlemen may have of the future, no one can say when we shall be strong enough to make and carry through by Republican votes alone a revision of the tariff. If you are to read out of the party everybody who reminds you of your promises, or who has any of the old Republican habits of free speech and candid criticism, perhaps you may never be strong enough to control the House. [Applause.] Even if the fall elections should return a majority of Republicans, nearly a year and a half must elapse before the Fifty-first Congress can even meet, and if a tariff debate like this should then ensue, certainly two years must pass before the present tariff can be changed. And it is more than probable that even then the highly protected industries would still find some new reason why action should be postponed for another indefinite period, and that their representatives would vote again as many gems of poetry and prosaic tables of figures as we have heard for the last two weeks to demonstrate that the slightest alteration of the sacred tariff for the relief of the people, on whom some portions of it weigh heavily, would end forever the prosperity of the country.

And it is still more likely that gentlemen who are interested in the preservation intact of the present tariff would claim that the election of a Republican House was a verdict of the people against any revision whatsover. [Laughter.]

For my part I desire to consider this question now, in the Congress to which I was elected partly for the purpose of considering it. Whether the Fifty-first or Fifty-second or Fifty-third Congresses are to be Republican or Democratic, what their action may be in the changed circumstances under which they may meet, is something which concerns me at present very little. I propose to do what I can—recognizing how very little it is—towards fulfilling the promises of the party on this subject now, when I have an opportunity. [Applause.]

Second. It is an unpatriotic answer to the reasonable demand that our promises to reform the tariff be fulfilled to say that as a condition precedent we must first have a success of our own party. If the revision is right, if it is in the interest of the business and development of the country, as our conventions and our leading statesmen have said it was, I for one am willing to make it, whether there is any political capital in it or not.

It is a business question more than a political question, and it is a business question on which we are committed.

If a revision of the tariff is necessary, it seems to me to be as absurd to vote against it on party grounds as it would be to oppose the admittedly necessary appropriations for the Government because they are prepared in a Democratic committee and proposed to a Democratic House.

I am one of those who were disappointed that we have as yet before us no Republican bill to reform the tariff. I do not forget the excellent bill putting coal, sugar, molasses, rice, wool, and some raw materials on the free-list, introduced by my Republican friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], whose 43,000 votes at the last election demonstrate what a hold on his people his fidelity to their interests has given him. I admired his speech and I would gladly vote for his bill. But I mean that I had hoped that before this we would have had submitted to us a bill put forward by authority, framed by gentlemen whose length of service and great ability fitted them for such a task, a bill in regard to which all of us would have been consulted, in which our varying views could have been compromised, a bill in which all of us would have yielded something to reach a common agreement.

For such a bill, framed by such high authority, perfected by such consultation, and giving to the people of our city some of the benefits to which we think they are entitled, even if it did not give us all which we could desire, I would have given my support most heartly. Instead of such a bill, those of us who think that the reform of the tariff is a business question, and who are committed to its support, are given so far only an eloquent denunciation of the manner in which this bill under consideration was made. For myself, I do not know that I care particularly how it was made or who made it. If the gentlemen who denounce its authors and the place where it was constructed will prepare, in a manner in their judgment more suitable for the purpose, a better bill than this one, I shall certainly be glad to give my support to their measure in preference to any other. But if I am asked to oppose this bill, not so much on account of its contents as on account of its history, I must decline to do so, even if I stand alone on this side of the House.

The history of the bill before it came before us is as immaterial to me as was the political history of the voters who sent me here before their appearance at the polls. I did not decline their suffrages on account of their antecedents, and if 6,500 of them could afford to forget their Democracy and give that district to a Republican I can in my turn forget the origin of this bill in the consideration of the question whether it is in the interest of my district and in the line of what I claimed in the canvass to be the belief of my party and my own belief. There is something better than Republicanism or Democracy, and that is common honesty. I have insisted, over and over for years in my district, that the Republican party was committed to tariff reform. I have attacked, in the canvass, my Democratic opponent for doing exactly that which gentlemen here propose that the Republican party should do. If the gentlemen in charge of the party interests on this floor propose to abandon the position which I and others have defended and insisted upon, it is not for me to criticise their wisdom; but I can not recognize their authority to make me give up the convictions which were good Republican doctrine when I adopted them and to break promises which I feel bound in honor to fulfill.

I can not as yet know in what shape this bill will come before us for final action. I believe that it should be amended in many particulars before it is passed, and I have submitted and shall submit some amendments which seem to me necessary. I can not as yet know whether or not a Republican substitute will be offered, or if there be one what it will cover. This much, however, I know now, that whenever I have an opportunity to vote for any measure which seems to offer the relief which I believe my people are entitled to have, and which I have myself for years insisted should be given them, I shall not fail to vote in their interest and for my own convictions, without regard to the consequences of my vote to myself. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, when I requested the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] to permit me to interrupt him my object was to make a statement which would have relieved him very greatly from seeming, if not intentional, misrepresentation of a fact to which his statement related. I wanted to say to him, and I now avail myself of the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan to make the statement, that he who undertakes to make a comparison of figures between 1867 and 1861 as to the sheep flocks of Ohio and then undertakes to apply those figures to a solution of the effect of the tariff revision of 1867 upon that industry errs very greatly in the force of his argument.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The tariff of 1867 found the sheep flocks of Ohio of a character not fitted for the production of wool; they were killed and sold in various ways. As rapidly as new grades of sheep could be imported and bred the flocks of sheep grew up in Ohio, and steadily improved in numbers until 1883. I have included in the speech which I had the honor to make a table showing the exact number of sheep in Ohio, the steady growth of the flocks up to 1884, and their steady diminution from 1884 to the present time. I place these statements as matters of fact against the mere flippant declaration of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. DALZELL. I had no intention to take any part in this discussion. My name is not on the Speaker's list, and I have the floor now only by the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN], who yielded to me a portion of his time.

I do not rise to make a speech in defense of the protective system, but to correct some gross misstatements of fact that have been made on the floor of this House in respect to certain of the industries of my district, to expose in their true light the illogical, inconsequential, and

basurd conclusions sought to be drawn from those misstatements, and to resent impertinent intrusion into the private affairs of certain of my constituents and misrepresentations in respect thereto.

I find the text for the few remarks that I propose to make in the very extraordinary screed read on the floor of this House on Friday last by the gentleman who represents the Erie district of Pennsylvania. I call it extraordinary because, for one reason, the gentleman saw fit therein to class himself with statesmen, and at the same time to characterize as a "demagogue with his mouth full of catch-words," and "a Bourbon," every member of that very large and very respectable class that does not believe that political economy is an exact science, or that the gentleman from Erie is a statesman. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I shall not stop to discuss his claims to that lofty title nor to explore with a precision which might prove distasteful so as exactly to locate "a demagogue with his mouth full of catch-words." The American people may very safely be left to pass judgment on that question, and history generally manages to locate public men in their proper places without the use of such men's own yard-sticks.

Nor shall I stop to discuss the learned propositions of constitutional law to which the gentleman holds. I prefer not to measure swords with him in that arena. With respect to the constitutional right to levy a protective tariff I am a Bourbon to the extent that the origin of the Constitution, the practice of the Republic for a hundred years, the opinions of the fathers, and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are amply satisfying to my conservative mind.

But I would like to know who it was that told the gentleman that Thomas Jefferson ever said any such thing as he puts into his mouth as having been said in answer to Alexander Hamilton when, as the gentleman states, Hamilton and Washington were engaged in "building up a business aristocracy as an important part of a projected government of corruption and splendor." I say to the gentleman that whoever gave him the information played on his credulity; that Thomas Jefferson, in his sixth annual message to Congress, in 1806, discussing the question of a surplus, put the pertinent inquiry, "Shall we suppress the impost and give the advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?" And I would be further pleased to be advised in what edition of American history the gentleman found it recorded that the Presidential campaign of 1800 was fought on the issue of protective tariff and settled on the gentleman's side "by the American people in favor of Thomas Jefferson and the Constitution." I fear that somebody again has been playing on his credulity. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But when the gentleman leaves those departments of statesmanship which involve history and philosophy and quotation and gets down to a description of the present bill, I do not find so much fault with him.

I find that the bill has been framed in the interest of the whole people, and for two purposes.

A MEMBER. Who says that?

Mr. DALZELL. I am reading from the speech of the gentleman from the Erie district.

First, to stay the mounting surplus in the Treasury, and, second, to relieve the overburdened industries of the country from excessive taxation, the proceeds of which do not pass into the Treasury, but go directly to the support of grasping monopolies, which are for the most part combined in utterly indefensible and atrociously oppressive trusts.

We shall find a little later on that the statesman from Erie is the inveterate and unrelenting foe of monopolies and the enthusiastic champion of the wage-worker and of the rights of labor. [Laughter.] Now, the method by which this twofold benign purpose is to be accomplished is also twofold. Our industries are to be relieved and our labor interests advanced by throwing open to the world our markets with respect to certain things to be put upon the free-list, and the revenue is to be decreased by lowering the import duties 7.7 per cent.; so that the imports that are now kept out by the present tariff may come in in an ever-increasing stream under the new. I do not believe that I need discuss that part of the gentleman's position, because I am again Bourbon enough to believe that history repeats itself; and as all experience in the past discloses that lower import duties mean increased revenue, so I believe that all experience in the future will disclose the same thing.

But I come down now to that in which I am particularly interested, and which in all probability prompted my appearance on the floor today. The statesman from Erie asserts that the proposition that protection gives a home market to the farmer is, to use his elegant language, "a fallacy and a fraud," and he illustrates his position by supposing a case, namely, that of a farmer in the neighborhood of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, at Braddock, in my district, and this, as I say, is the point at which I begin to have some interest. As I have lived within sight of Braddock Field for nearly twenty years, and in sight of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works ever since they were erected, I may be permitted to say that the illustration of the gentleman contains not a line or a letter consistent with truth. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The fact is that he could by no possibility have selected an illustration which would more thoroughly and effectually refute his theory. Industrious farmers near the Edgar Thomson Steel Works have been affected as farmers always have been, are now, and always will be, by the planting of a manufacturing establishment in their midst.

They are no longer obliged to raise wheat or to come into competition with Mark Lane, London. The teeming population of the steel-works furnishes to them a market, and a market such as they never had before, and for products that they could never sell before—for all sorts of garden truck, vegetables, milk, butter, and all that sort of thing. If the statesman from Erie did not know that, he was grossly ignorant; if he was not grossly ignorant, his is a bad case of moral strabismus. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But when he pursues his illustration further, to the extent of picturing the farmer, discouraged but not disheartened, struggling to pay off the mortgage upon his farm which cost him $100 an acre, the ridiculousness of his illustration becomes sublimely grotesque. The men who bought their farms in the neighborhood of Braddock for $100 an acre have long since sold them at $2,000 an acre. The statesman from Erie [laughter], if he wanted to buy an acre there, would find it difficult to buy one anywhere within miles of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the banks of the Monongahela River, or in the valley of Turtle Creek, for $2,000 an acre.

But, to pursue the gentleman's illustration, my heart fairly bled for this industrious farmer (who must have been a neighbor of mine) when he found himself obliged to pay 3.3 cents a pound for a steel beam. [Laughter.] What the farmer wanted the steel beam for the statesman from Erie did not explain. [Renewed laughter.] But, thinking it over, I consoled myself with the idea that he probably did not want many pounds and that possibly he had something left out of the $2,000 that he got for the last acre that he sold.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the erection of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works has changed Braddock from a straggling village into a busy town, filled with an intelligent, industrious, cheerful, and prosperous population; a town wherein there are two national banks, handsome stores, paved streets, an opera house, and a public library founded by the munificence of Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

Mr. SCOTT. Out of proceeds plundered from the American people [applause on the Democratic side]; contributed as a part of the plunder to secure the $500,000 that he admitted to me he had put in his pocket in one year.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I had no idea that I had hurt the gentleman half so badly thus far. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I hope he will try to keep his temper.

Mr. SCOTT. I will answer you if the House will give me the time.

Mr. DALZELL. But the misapprehension of the statesman from Erie as to what he was talking about when he made use of this illustration is mild as compared with his delusion when he talks about the profits of the steel company and the percentage of wages paid to their employés. It is just at this point (and the gentleman has only this moment illustrated it) that his moral strabismus becomes actually pitiable. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

In estimating the cost of manufacture, and therefore the manufacturer's profit, the statesman from Erie ignores altogether $20,000,000 of invested capital. [Laughter.] He omits any allowance for depreciation of plant, for insurance, for taxes, for repairs, for transportation, for commissions. He allows nothing even for the cost of fuel to furnish the steam power, and he omits, according to his own confession, the cost of spiegeleisen, an element necessary to be used in the manufacture of steel rails.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I am not dealing now with anybody but the statesman from Erie; the statesman from Ohio may come further along. [Laughter.]

It must therefore be absolutely and mathematically true that the figures he gives as to cost and profits are deceptive and unreliable. To suit his own purposes he further puts a fancy figure upon steel rails, namely $37.50, when the report of his own committee, which he signs, puts it at $31.50.

Mr. SCOTT. Here are your own figures on the price of steel rails.

Mr. DALZELL. I do hope the gentleman will keep his temper. [Laughter.] Add now to the cost of a ton of steel rails at $26.79, the gentleman's own figures, the omitted items of cost, and take $6 off his selling price, and then, having solved that problem, define for me the difference between a statesman and a demagogue. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] His figures as to the percentage of wages to the cost of production are even wilder, if that were possible, than those he has already given us. He seems to assume that Bessemer pig-iron grows on the trees at the Edgar Thomson furnace, and even then he does not allow anything for the labor of picking it. [Laughter.]

All the figures that relate to labor, beginning with the ore in the mine, its loading and unloading; with the coal in the hills, its mining, its carriage to the coke oven, its transformation into coke, its transportation to the place of consumption—all the various figures that go to make a ton of Bessemer steel represent very little more than labor, are suppressed; and the absurd conclusion is announced that the percent-

age of labor to the selling price is 10.9 per cent. Why, the first figure in his calculation is $18 for a ton of Bessemer pig; and he knows—I think he knows—that of the $18, $16.50 represent labor; and he deliberately left that out in his calculation when he read his screed in the House.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a duty of $6.72 a ton on pig-iron and $17 on steel rails. Does the gentleman forget that?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not.

Mr. SCOTT. Then he is misstating and misrepresenting the facts. Recollect that there is a duty of $6.72 a ton on pig-iron and $17 on steel rails, making $23.72.

Mr. DALZELL. Yet the statesman from Erie, when he comes to boasting, contradicts himself. He tells us that from his practical experience of a third of a century in coal-mines, labor there gets 70 to 85 per cent. of the selling price of the product. I suppose that must have been coal not mined to be made into coke or to go to steel works. With respect to his figures representing wages of coal-miners, which you will find in his speech in the RECORD, I was told to-day by an intelligent and competent miner that if any such wages were ever paid they were exceptional.

I hope the gentleman is listening to me now, because I affirm that if those wages ever were paid, they were paid at Scott Haven, in Pennsylvania, in store orders upon a truck store, kept in violation of the laws of Pennsylvania, by means of which the employer is enabled to rob his employés.

The gentleman's figures as to the steel beams are just as inaccurate as his other figures, for the reason that he starts to get the final result with the steel-rail figures as a premise, and of course the result must be as incorrect as the premise.

Now, that is about all that the gentleman said with respect to this particular industry in my immediate neighborhood, and having demonstrated that with respect to this industry his figures are wrong, I have accomplished my purpose in rising, and I do not care to pursue him further.

With respect to every other subject that he touched upon, it will be found on examination that his methods were the same; and he even resorts to the flimsy business of disproving the plain conceded facts of history by the percentage method, by which I mean, of course, the method which ignores the fact that a given sum is a larger percentage of a small sum than it is of a larger one. [Laughter.]

But I must not leave my colleague simply with words of criticism. I have words of praise for him, too. My heart bounded as I heard him roll off from his screed words of denunciation of "monopolies" and "base and indefensible trusts." I congratulate him upon becoming the champion of labor; but I congratulate more the great army of labor in this country upon the accession to its ranks of the statesman from Erie. I cry a threatening warning to the hosts of "monopoly" and of "pernicious and indefensible trusts" that their destroyer is in the field. What labor has gained and monopoly lost by the conversion of the statesman from Erie it would be difficult for any one not living, as I do, in Western Pennsylvania adequately to appreciate.

Turn for a moment, if you will, to the autobiography of the statesman of Erie as contained in the Congressional Directory. [Laughter.] I read:

Engaged, in 1850, in the coal and shipping business, owning and running several vessels on the Lakes; subsequently became largely interested in the manufacture of iron and the mining of coal, as well as in the construction and operation of railroads—

[Laughter.]

I beg your attention to this—

either as president or director of various lines aggregating over 22,000 miles of completed road, the greatest number of miles of railroad, probably, which any one individual was ever an officer or director of.

[Laughter and applause.]

Think of that for a labor champion [renewed laughter] and for an opponent of monopolies and indefensible trusts? There will be much joy among the miners of Scott Haven; there will be tears of gratitude on many a blanched cheek; the light of hope in many a lack-luster eye; a benediction and the sweet incense of thanksgiving from humble hearthstones in the poverty-stricken huts of Scott Haven, when the news shall arrive that the statesman of Erie is no longer their oppressor, but has become their champion and friend. [Laughter and applause.]

Think of the consternation in the strongholds of monopoly and amongst the naughty partners in indefensible trusts!

If it were given me, Mr. Chairman, to advise the historian of the future, I would have him choose for his most dramatic page the statesman of Erie, when like some mediæval knight clad in armor, with visor down and lance apoise, his pennon flying, its motto, "Death to monopoly," he rides down the cheering line of admiring labor, full tilt in his conquering career of glory. [Laughter and applause.]

But here, Mr. Chairman, I would leave him with only a word of friendly advice, for which I charge him nothing. It is not statesmanlike to discuss the private affairs of your neighbors behind their backs. Besides, this House and the country are no more interested in the question whether Mr. Andrew Carnegie has a summer castle amid the hills of his native Scotland than they are in the question whether the statesman of Erie has a $5,000 clerk and a $10,000 cook. [Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening I received a letter by special messenger from the member from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Washington, May* 15, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Some time during the session to-morrow, probably in the afternoon, I propose to make some observations with respect to your speech of Friday last. I think you will probably be interested, and hope you may be present.

Yours, truly,

JOHN DALZELL.

Hon. W. L. SCOTT.

A letter so courteous, Mr. Chairman, could not but receive that consideration to which it seemed to be entitled. I have therefore, sir, remained here all day waiting until the member from Pennsylvania might have an opportunity to explain to this House and the country wherein, as has been whispered about, I was mistaken in the facts presented in my speech of Friday last. Sir, I expected the gentleman, as the special representative of the trust interests of this country, to come here prepared at least to say something in rebuttal of the facts I have presented. With those interests, representing $20,000,000, at his back to supply him with the data necessary to refute my statements, with five days to prepare a carefully written speech which he has just delivered, with time unlimited in which to deliver it, I have waited here until this late hour expecting to hear the statements I have made controverted, or at least denied. But, sir, the gentleman from Pennsylvania confines himself to the subject only in a criticism of my historical allusions and ridiculing my illustration of the Braddock farmer. There he stops and devotes the remainder of his speech to a personal vilification of myself.

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he has ever heard of the case of the Thomson estate?

Mr. DALZELL. Against whom?

Mr. SCOTT. Against the Pennsylvania Steel Company. I propose to state here facts brought up in a court of justice and which can not be disputed.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh! I know all about that case.

Mr. SCOTT. I paid very close attention to what the gentleman said.

Mr. DALZELL. I am giving you attention.

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the Clerk simply to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the auditing of the account of the trustees of the estate of Edgar Thomson, the decedent, the following facts appeared:

The testator at his death owned one thousand shares of stock of the Pennsylvania Steel Company. This company being in need of funds, the stock at the time having been somewhat depressed, sold to the Pennsylvania Railway Company six thousand shares, and used the proceeds to improve its plant and carry on a larger business, which proved very remunerative, and in December, 1881, the directors of the Pennsylvania Steel Company authorized their president to repurchase of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company five thousand shares at $265 a share; which was accordingly done and duly paid for. At the purchase it was stipulated that the Pennsylvania Steel Company should immediately offer to its shareholders to take their pro rata proportion of these five thousand shares at par, and that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company should also take and pay for the shares which might be allotted to it on the remaining one thousand shares which had not been resold to the Pennsylvania Steel Company.

On the same day a communication marked "confidential" was sent to each stockholder of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, citing the facts and offering to apportion these shares pro rata and at par among the stockholders of the company. The rate for fractional shares was fixed at $200 a share. At the time of this purchase the undivided profits of the Pennsylvania Steel Company amounted to $3,286,423.51. The net cost to the company of the purchase was $825,000, leaving a surplus of profits which amounted to $2,461,423.51.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks of Friday last I only referred to one steel works in our State in connection with their enormous profits under the protective system, and I have merely had read the case which I sent to the Clerk's desk as corroborative evidence of what I stated in connection with the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their profits, and which the gentleman in his remarks has not attempted to refute. The Pennsylvania Steel Company, with a capital stock of $2,000,000, I think, after the payment of dividends, had surplus earnings amounting to $3,286,423.51, and these large accumulated profits were earned during a period when the iron and steel industries of this country could hardly be called in their most prosperous condition.

But, Mr. Chairman, the member from Pennsylvania appears here as the special attorney of the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their interests, and he has not had one word to say on behalf of the wage-workers employed in that industry.

Will the member from Pennsylvania rise in his seat and say that he believes Carnegie & Co., in forcing their men by Pinkerton's detectives to go back at 10 per cent. reduction on their wages, considering their enormous profits, can be justified? Does he justify it?

Mr. DALZELL. Do you want me to answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, I want you to answer it.

Mr. DALZELL. There are two answers. The first is that you are trying to divert this House from the subject that I discussed, and which I would like you to meet. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, answer the question. Do not try to evade it.

Mr. DALZELL. And this is the second, that the statement that

the Edgar Thomson people compelled their employés to go back by detectives is untrue in fact.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not state that, but I stated that they covered their works with Pinkerton detectives and then hired foreign labor to come there and drive their men out. And you are standing here to-day professing to represent an enlightened constituency, and yet advocate the man who would be guilty of such an act as that. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. SCOTT. No; just let me proceed now.

Mr. DALZELL. But do you not want me to answer your question?

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the gentleman that he has mistaken his calling.

Mr. DALZELL. That may be; but do you not want me to reply?

Mr. SCOTT. I do; but I have but five minutes left. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Then you ought not to ask any questions.

Mr. BRUMM. We will give an extension of your time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the statesman from Erie allow a question right at this point?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir; you are a general interrupter, and I will not yield to your questions. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I admire the patriotism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the interest of those he represents. But I would like to know how many days' labor he ever furnished to the wage-worker of this country. I would like to know when the week came around how many men have ever been on his pay-rolls.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I am not a millionaire, and do not pretend to be. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, you are not. You have had the opportunity of being a millionaire, but you have not had the brains to get there. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no, I had not the opportunity.

Mr. SCOTT. It is just such gentlemen as the member from Pennsylvania whom the Constitution and the laws of this country are intended to protect and whom we are all endeavoring to protect to enable all, whatever their abilities may be, to get an honest living.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I can take care of myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not denied, or at least he has not submitted any figures or facts denying, the statement I made that $4.09 was the total amount that labor received in the production of a ton of steel rails.

Mr. DALZELL. Why, certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I can prove right here that what you state is not true.

Mr. DALZELL. Now will the statesman from Erie allow me just a minute?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. Here is a contract under seal, as awarded by the board of arbitration between the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their employés, specifying the number of men employed, the work they were to do, and the percentage each man was to get. I will further state to the gentleman that if he can induce his principals to open up their books, if he will get up on this floor and offer a resolution appointing a select committee to go to the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and ascertain from them what they pay for their labor or what it costs to produce a ton of steel rails, I will open every book I have, every balance-sheet I have. I will take them up to Scott Haven and compare the wage-workers of Scott Haven with those of the industries which the gentleman here is pleading for, and I will abide by the report of that committee, and a majority of it may be gentlemen on the other side if they are only honest and square men.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman include, also, his anthracite miners?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the anthracite miners, too.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that a question so important as this to the whole country could have been discussed on this floor without personal attacks upon any gentleman. I made no personal charges against the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works. I merely stated facts in connection with that industry as shown by their contracts, and I merely stated what the senior member of that firm had admitted to me in the Committee on Ways and Means, that he had drawn this amount of money which I stated he had drawn, namely, $1,500,000 in one year as his share of the profits, and I made certain illustrations in connection with it. But it appeared to have stuck in the heart of the gentleman who has just preceded me, and in answer to my facts he comes here and makes a personal attack upon me. I can say to him, sir, that I mind it no more than I would the barking of a dog in the street. [Applause on the Democratic side and derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

I will stand upon my record at home and with my people. And if I have ever been the oppressor of labor, if I have ever ejected a man from his home, if I have ever endeavored in my life, although I have been, I may say, a large employer of labor, to put one laborer in the place of another, or to force one man in the place of another; if I have employed a detective—not a Pinkerton detective, merely, but any other kind of a detective—to come and protect my property or to protect it against the men that are working for me, or have worked for me, I, sir, will resign my seat and leave this Hall the day it is proved.

Mr. BRUMM. Does the gentleman not contribute to pay the coal and iron police?

Mr. SCOTT. I never so contributed. I know you made a statement on this floor that I had employed Pinkerton's detectives, which is false.

Mr. BRUMM. And I will prove it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will make you prove it. I am going to bring you before the bar of this House and make you prove that charge.

Mr. BRUMM. All right; I will be there.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument in regard to my employing a $10,000 cook has the same foundation for truth that some of his other statements have; and if such were the fact, sir, I could only compare the wages paid my cook with the wages paid by his clients at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works. As to the salaries paid my secretaries, or at least those who assist me in my business, if he refers to the men in my employ, I can tell him that there are a good many of them who get more than $5,000 a year.

Now, I have nothing more to say. I have been identified with the laborers of this country all my life; I have worked and toiled with them; and when I start out to rob anybody or to get anybody's money it will not be the money of the wage-worker of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House the committee will now rise.

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 bill H. R. 9051, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived the House, pursuant to order, stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

The House was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at this evening's session.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

TARIFF.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. WICKHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in discussing no matter of ordinary legislation. The bill under debate touches upon subjects that affect every hearth-stone in the land. It will reach, if passed, with its invisible hand into the parlor of the rich, and fail not to affect the cabin of the poor. It will not only touch these extremes, by its direct action, but also reach them by its equally as certain indirect effect. It will come home not to one class alone, but to all classes and conditions.

Well may I say, then, that it is no ordinary subject of legislation. It will determine, if adopted, the manner in which, the extent to which, and effect with which, all the vast revenues necessary to support the immense machinery of our Government shall be drawn into the Treasury.

A piece of legislation, having for its end and aim such results, demands our best endeavor and our most patient consideration, and the exercise of our highest patriotism. We may not, each for himself, consider alone the wants and interests of our respective localities, but it becomes our duty to take a broad and comprehensive view of the whole country, with the intent and purpose to do that which will redound most to the welfare of all the people.

If we honestly approach this discussion in this spirit, with our gaze fixed steadily and unswervingly upon this polar sta which should guide all our actions, we can not fail to do that which will commend itself to our conscience and better judgment, and resul in benefits, far reaching and permanent, to all classes and conditions—the high and the low, the rich and the poor—the only legitimate and just object of all general legislation.

OUR SYSTEM.

We have, and for many years have had, a protective system of revenue collection. It is not perhaps in some of its details without imperfections and defects, but it was designed to have and has had the effect

of protecting our industries against the competition of foreign industries of like kinds.

It is in the main a system that sprang into existence through the necessity for a large revenue growing out of the war of the rebellion, and it has been continued with some modifications through the necessity of large revenue, growing out of the results of the war.

War is a curse taken in every view, but in some of the aspects of our late war it was not an unmixed evil. It not only destroyed the worst system of human bondage that ever existed among men; it not only resulted in a restored Union of the States, more firmly cemented than before, but it caused to be demonstrated, in keeping with what protectionists have always contended, that a protective tariff would not only bring prosperity to industries already begun, but would encourage and stimulate the establishment and prosperity of new ones in the land; that such a tariff would not only stimulate and develop manufactures, strictly so-called, but would also protect labor engaged in all other departments as well—in mining, agriculture, stock-raising, wool-growing, and common day labor; that it would drive the blood of prosperity into every artery of the commercial and industrial body; that while it would not decrease the estates of the rich, it would immensely enhance the material prosperity and comfort of the great middling and poorer classes; that from a country comparatively poor and undeveloped it would in less than a quarter of a century develop a mighty empire of prosperous people, and that, too, notwithstanding during the same period a relentless civil war of four years' duration wiped out of existence labor and property to the extent of $5,000,000,000, and destroyed or greatly impaired the energies and producing power of a million of men, equal at least to twenty million years' labor of a strong man; that it would, from a time when the middling class lived in a comparative deprivation of many of the necessaries, bring us to a time when the poor would be living in good houses, well furnished, be wearing good clothing and enjoying many other comforts and even luxuries.

Before the enactment of the tariffs of 1861 and 1867 it is within the memory of very many upon this floor that the homes of the mechanics, laborers, and farmers of our country contained only the barest necessaries; that upon their floors were found no carpets, in their "best rooms" no musical instruments, upon their walls no decorations of art; that their means of transportation, for the most part, consisted of the ox-cart or lumber wagon; while to-day, after twenty-five years of a protective system, upon their floors are found the finest products of the loom, in their parlors are heard the sweet tones of the piano, their walls are covered with exquisite designs in paper or fresco and hung with the productions of the artist, while the owners ride to their devotions or on their pleasure in carriages which in days before the war were rarely used by the rich.

These results of a protective system, an enumeration of which might be greatly enlarged, were, long before the beginning of the tariff system that made them possible, even from the beginning of our government, foretold and promised by our wisest and most patriotic statesmen. What their clear and prophetic vision saw our day has realized.

Yea, more; the establishment of the Union of these States grew out of a necessity felt by the people of the colonies for protection against the importation of foreign-made goods and the consequent destruction of our own manufactures.

During the period between the Revolutionary war and the adoption of the Constitution, a period of six years, the distress and depression and gloom that had settled upon the people as a result of the absolutely free foreign trade under which they were living, which had resulted in the destruction of the manufactures of the land and the drainage of all the specie from the country, drove our fathers to the plan of the formation of a "more perfect union," as a measure by which to secure protection against England, who had become tenfold more formidable by reason of the importations of the products of her factories, in competition with ours, than she had been during the war on the battle-field.

I know that upon this floor, during this debate, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] has contended that there is no warrant in the Constitution for the passage of laws designed to protect labor. He asks, with great emphasis: "But what right have you to protect labor?" Mr. Chairman, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and before the Revolution, there was a well-defined and accepted distinction between the two powers of "levying taxes to raise revenue" and "laying duties for the regulation of commerce." The right to regulate commerce by the laying of duties was never denied to the mother country by the colonies, but the right to levy taxes for revenue was denied, because the colonies were without representation.

As early as 1766 Benjamin Franklin, in his famous examination before the House of Commons, recognized the distinction. The questions and his answers were as follows:

Q. What will be the opinion of the Americans on these resolutions? [Asserting the right of Great Britain to tax America.]

A. They will think them unconstitutional and unjust.

Q. Was it an opinion in America before 1763 that the Parliament had no right to lay taxes and duties there?

A. I never heard any objections to the right of laying duties to regulate commerce, but a right to lay internal-revenue taxes was never thought to be in Parliament.

Q. On what do you found your opinion that the people of America make any such distinction?

A. I know that whenever the subject has occurred in conversation it has appeared the opinion of every one that we could not be taxed by a Parliament when we were not represented. But the payment of duties laid as regulations of commerce was never disputed.

In the same year Lord Chatham, in the House of Commons, in his celebrated speech on the "right of taxing America," recognized the distinction when he said:

If the gentleman does not understand the difference between external and internal taxes I can not help it. There is a plain distinction between taxes laid for the purpose of raising revenue and duties imposed for the regulation of trade for the accommodation of the subject, although in the consequences some revenue may incidentally arise from the latter.

On the same occasion he further said:

The commons of America, represented in their general assemblies, have ever been in possession of this constitutional right of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it! At the same time this kingdom, as the supreme governing and legislative power, has always bound the colonies by her laws, by her regulations and restrictions in trade, in navigation, in manufactures, in everything except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

In the House of Lords, in 1775, we find Lord Chatham using the following language:

Let this distinction, then, remain forever ascertained—taxation is theirs, commercial regulation is ours. As an American, I would recognize to England her supreme right of regulating commerce and navigation; as an Englishman by birth and principle, I recognize to the Americans their supreme, unalienable right in their property—a right which they are justified in the defense of to the last extremity.

Among the earliest proceedings of the Congress of Independence, recorded in its Journals October 14, 1774, may be found the following unanimous declaration with reference to the colonies:

They are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial legislatures, where their right of representation can alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal policy, subject only to the negative of the sovereign, in such manner as has been heretofore used and accustomed; but from the necessity of the case, and in regard to the mutual interests of both countries, we cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British Parliament as are bona fide restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole empire to the mother country, and the commercial benefits of the respective members, excluding every idea of taxation, external or internal, for raising a revenue on the subjects in America without their consent.

In 1778, Lord North, for the purpose of winning back the insurgent American colonies to their allegiance to the British Crown, procured the passage of a bill by Parliament, which contained an offer of unconditional surrender of the original ground of controversy, in these words:

It is expedient to declare that the King and Parliament of Great Britain will not impose any duty or tax for the purpose of raising a revenue in the colonies, except only such duties as may be expedient to impose for the regulation of commerce.

I have quoted these authorities to show that there was previous to and during the Revolutionary war, and down to the adoption of the Constitution, a well-understood and well-defined distinction between "duties imposed for the regulation of commerce" and "duties imposed for raising a revenue." And we find this distinction well preserved in the Constitution, for we find expressed in that instrument not only the power conferred upon Congress—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

But the further and distinct power—

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

It seems clear, in the light of the language of the men whom I have quoted, that the power to regulate commerce involved the power to restrain and regulate the importation of foreign articles of commerce. But we are not limited to our own opinion. Let us hear what historians, framers of the Constitution, their contemporaries, and the great expounders of its meaning have said. James Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution, and whose qualifications as an expounder of its meaning will not be denied by any one, said in his letter to Joseph C. Cabell under date of September 18, 1828:

It is a simple question, under the Constitution of the United States, whether the power to regulate trade with foreign nations as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers embraces the object of encouraging by duties, restrictions, and prohibitions the manufactures and products of the country. And the affirmative must be inferred from the following considerations:

Which he proceeds at length to enumerate. Bancroft, in speaking of this period, says:

Of the many causes promoting union, four above others exercised a steady and commanding influence. The new Republic as one nation must have power to regulate its foreign commerce, to colonize its large domain, to provide an adequate revenue, and to establish justice in domestic trade, by prohibiting the several States from impairing the obligation of contracts. Each of these causes was of vital importance; but the necessity for regulating commerce gave the immediate impulse to a more perfect Constitution.

It was with the belief impressed upon his mind that the impending ruin hanging over the people of the Confederacy was the result of the unrestrained foreign trade, that Fisher Ames said in this House in 1789, when debating the first tariff bill:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote general welfare.

Daniel Webster, that giant expositor of the Constitution, and who was thoroughly acquainted with its history and to the causes which led to its adoption, said in 1833:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

And in 1844 he said:

I defy the man in any degree conversant with history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, to say that this [laying duties for the protection of American labor and industries] was not a leading, I may almost say, the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

Rufus Choate, another great constitutional lawyer, said in 1842:

A whole people, a whole generation of our fathers, had in view as one great end and purpose of their new Government the acquisition of the means of restraining by governmental action the importation of foreign manufactures for the encouragement of manufactures and of labor at home, and desired and meant to do this by clothing the new Government with this specific power of regulating commerce.

As soon as the First Congress assembled petitions flowed in upon it from every section of the Union, from the South as well as the North, praying for the enactment of a law to protect the manufacturing interests of the country, and Congress, in response to this almost universal desire, met it in the second law it passed, which was an act to secure the coasting trade and protect the mechanic arts by discriminating duties.

Since the enactment of this law many others from time to time have been passed by Congress, more or less protective in their design or effect, according to the political complexion of the Congress at the time.

And it has been our experience during the hundred years that have passed away that our people of all classes have been the most prosperous during the times when we have had the most pronounced protection.

It will be found upon the examination of our history that every period of gloom, despondency, and bankruptcy through which we have passed has followed the abandonment of protective tariffs and a resort to those for revenue only, save one—the last—which clearly was the result of the enormous waste of life, labor, and property caused by the war of the rebellion; and let me say that this one was of comparatively short duration, because of the magnificent recuperative power which we had as a people developed through the fostering effect of our tariff protection.

Upon the truth of what I have just said I call a Democratic witness, the Atlanta Constitution, a paper that has shown its devotion to Democracy for more than a generation. This is what it said in a recent issue:

OUR TARIFF HISTORY.

It was not until some time after the colonies became independent that there were duties placed upon imports. From 1784 to 1790, inclusive, the imports from England exceeded the exports from America in the sum of $52,372,875, and a clamor arose for protection.

The first tariff law passed was approved by the President July 4, 1789. Its preamble recited: "Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

From the year 1796, when the protective tariff was in full operation, to 1801, a period of seven years, the exports of this country exceeded the imports by $89,571,316, leaving England in debt to America. In 1824, although the revenue was sufficient, a new tariff was adopted with higher duties in order to extend the benefits of protection This measure had the active support of Presidents Monroe, Jackson, and John Quincy Adams.

In 1833, owing to the demands of South Carolina, then in almost open rebellion, a revised tariff law was passed, lowering the duties to about 20 per cent.

By 1840 this "tariff revision" had so diminished the revenue, and manufactures were so prostrate, that the Government and the people were almost in bankruptcy. This caused a raising of customs duties to the protective point in 1842, under which trade revived and the Government's credit was preserved.

In 1846 a reduction was made in tariff rates, and during the next eleven years, while these reduced rates were in force, the revenues fell short of the expenditures by $21,790,805. In 1860 the Government had to borrow $20,000,000 to maintain its credit.

The duties were increased in March, 1861, and since then, while the war tariff has been reduced to natural proportions, the manufactures of America have flourished as never before.

By the passage of this bill and its enactment into law, we are called upon to enter upon an abandonment of and a departure from the policy established by our fathers, and written by them in our very Constitution; a policy under which we have grown from three millions of people to sixty millions; under which our property has increased from a few millions in value to the enormous aggregate of sixty billions, an average of $1,000 for every man, woman, and child in the land; an amount far outstripping the wealth of free-trade England, which less than a quarter of a century ago largely exceeded ours, and which she had been centuries accumulating; under which our people have not only increased their possessions so largely, but have increased their comforts and luxuries beyond those falling to the lot of any other people on the footstool, and which far exceed the wildest prophecies or dreams of the wildest visionary.

I say we are in this day and generation, after realizing all these benefits, a fitting description of which is beyond, far beyond, the power of my tongue to express, called upon to enter upon an experiment, to say the least of it; to put in peril and hazard all these magnificent and glorious results; all this wealth and consequent power; all this comfort; all this luxury; all this improvement in the condition of the laboring classes, by inaugurating a system that no man upon this floor, or elsewhere, has been able to show will not result in the great impairment, if not entire destruction, of them all.

I do not claim that the passage of this bill alone will cause the ruin of our industrial system; but I do say that if this bill becomes a law the wedge will have been entered that, by the future blows British effort and Democratic subserviency shall strike, will be driven to the complete rending asunder and final destruction of our grand system, from which so many and great blessings have flowed.

While the passage of this bill would not alone entirely ruin our industries, it would result in the destruction of many of them, and the consequent train of dire and far-reaching results in other branches.

I know that the advocates of this bill deny such a result and declaim eloquently of the beauties of free trade, or what they choose to call a revenue tariff, and lament and deplore the ruin that is sure to follow the further continuance of our present tariff. I know that they point to England and what they call her prosperity as an evidence of the beneficent effects of the system. I know that they read advice to us to adopt her policy from Englishmen and English books. But they forget that England's present system, so far as her manufactures are concerned, is one of the most powerfully protected systems in the world; they forget that her statesmen have seemed to think that her manufacturing proprietors were the only class that should have protection, while all other classes of producers and all classes of laborers should be subjected to the grinding and destructive effects of free trade; they forget that by allowing the entry into her ports free of duty of raw materials for her shops, and exempting her manufacturing capital from all direct tax under the excise, she has protected them, and so enabled them to undersell the manufacturers of other countries not protected by tariffs, or in some other way.

I know it is fashionable among so-called tariff reformers to point to England and talk of the advantages which free trade has given her industries, but those who have given study to this subject do not hesitate to say that she is a protective state, so far as her manufacturing proprietors are concerned, and this evidence is afforded by an advocate of free trade, who will not he charged with making such assertions to bolster a preconceived opinion.

David A. Wells, a pronounced free-trader and formerly Special Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and now a member of the Cobden Club, in his report for the year 1868, uses this significant language:

Again, a careful study of the financial systems of the various commercial nations of Europe has led the Commissioner unhesitatingly to the conclusion that whatever may be the state of European public opinion in respect to free trade, and whatever may be the claims preferred for it on the broad grounds of liberality and humanitarianism, the fiscal legislation of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and Russia is now, and always has been, framed solely and exclusively with reference to one object, namely, the promotion of supposed national self-interest, and has never had the slightest regard to the interest of any other nation, or to any arguments, other than those based upon specific national wants and specific national experiences.

Thus, the policy of Great Britain, which exempts capital employed in manufacturing and banking from all direct taxation under the excise, and all raw materials imported from foreign countries from all taxation under the customs, although not so termed, is undoubtedly protection in its most subtile and effective form, and as such has been recognized and commented on by the French economists.

It will thus be seen that England's fiscal policy is designed, not to favor her laboring poor, not to enable them to draw and receive higher wages, not to enable them to live easier and surround themselves with more comforts, but to enrich her manufacturing princes, to swell their plethoric coffers, and that, too, in disregard of the interests and welfare, not only of the artisans in her shops, but also regardless of the effect upon her farmers and common laborers.

Her legislation in this particular is clearly class legislation, designed to enrich the few and impoverish the many. That this is so, and that it is having the effect upon the laboring classes that might be expected, abundant testimony is at hand.

This is what Mr. Howard Vincent, M. P., says in a letter to the London Times:

No national party could possibly ignore the serious state of affairs now prevailing. It is detailed from day to day in your columns. Land worth from 25 to 75 per cent. less than forty years ago, and almost unsalable. Arable land thrown into pasture, yet fewer animals in the fields. Agricultural distress very similar to that described by Lord Shaftesbury as prevailing about 1844. In the towns hundreds starving, owing to factories being closed or working only half time. Deputations to local authorities praying for relief works. In the metropolis hungry men at every corner. Pauperism increasing. Discontent rising. Employment everywhere scarcer, while the population is rapidly multiplying.

There is no class, no profession, no avocation, no calling unaffected in some degree. Distress must always be felt more in some places and in some communities than in others. But the general fact is undeniable. The commissioner of police of the metropolis, the vestries, the guardians of the poor, as well as philanthropic societies and statesmen, may open registers for the unemployed, but that will not provide the employment, for little or none is to be found in town or country. Temporary remedies may be applied, but they will not be more effectual than palliatives to a malignant cancer.

Mr. Henry Champlain, M. P., recently stated in the House of Commons that the British farmers were losing £50,000,000, or $250,000,000 a year. In other words, England has ruined its farmers that its manufacturers might grow rich, while it has kept the wages of operatives as low as possible for the same reason.

Is it to be wondered at, in view of these acknowledged results of British free-trade class protection that the stalwart young English farmers

are leaving their unprofitable farms and flocking in such numbers to our shores? Or that her poets, that class so quick to respond to the cry of human distress, should, with pens dipped in the gall and bitterness of human want, be writing words like these:

Old England when, by tariffs low,
Protected fair from foreign foe,
Felt everywhere the thrill and glow
Of labor and prosperity.

But England showed another sight,
When Cobden's scheme with killing blight
Fell as the fall of gloomy night
On industry and husbandry.

By selfish greed and fierce tirade,
By class and party feeling swayed,
A "free," a falsely canting Trade
Was throned in pious tyranny.

Then came in cheap, poor foreign skill;
Then grew the rich man richer still,
The while the worker's cup did fill
With idleness and beggary.

But richer yet the few will grow,
And labor yet shall sink more low,
If England's conscience still be slow
To execrate the infamy.

E'en now the curse of Cobden's hand
Lies on our workshops, on our land,
And, wanting food and labor, stand
Our artisans and peasantry.

The misery deepens; what shall save
Our men from sinking to the slave,
But that we doom to deepest grave
Free trade with all its villainy?

False, false to England and her race,
There let it hide its traitor face,
And lasting scorn and dark disgrace
Shall be its fitting sepulchre.

Or words like these:

Clothed all in contradictions I saw this fetich dread,
This hypocrite, free trade, lift high its vaunting head;
If reason to his hearers would any warning bring,
Thus, thought I, to his fellows an Englishman might sing:

"Why starve your workingmen through foreign labor cheap,
The labor of such misery as makes the angels weep?
Why drive them off abroad, your toilers skilled and true,
And open wide the door to a vagrant foreign crew?

"Think you this greed of gold shall add to England's fame?
Know you these foreign slaves shall bring eternal shame?
The hand of Cain is on it, this cheapness that you seek,
The sweat of blood of men, the tears of women weak."

Lines, that if they do not contain so much poetic art, none the less echo the woe that England's humane poet sung in his "Song of the Shirt" forty years ago, when he heard the cry of her who was—

Sewing at once with a double thread,
A shroud as well as a shirt.

And wailing in her anguish—

O God, that bread should be so dear
And flesh and blood so cheap!

The President in his message calls upon Congress to enter upon the same policy that has ruined the farmers of England. He substantially recommends the removal of tariff duties from several of our greatest agricultural staples.

While the comparative unimportance of the agricultural interests of England as compared with her manufacturing interests might in the minds of British statesmen have furnished an excuse for their course, so ruinous to England's farmers, no such excuse can be found for the members of this House.

Agriculture in America, with her breadth of acreage and fertility of soil, holds the most important place among industrial pursuits. In view of the fact that, according to the last census, of 17,392,099 of our population engage in all kinds of industries, 7,670,493, almost nine-twentieths of the whole, are employed in agriculture, of which a very large proportion, if not all, are engaged in the production of one or more of the articles to which the bill under discussion proposes to apply the principle of free trade by removing all duty upon their importation, this House can not say that the interests of the farmers are so small comparatively that their success and prosperity may be sacrificed or greatly impaired for the benefit of those engaged in other pursuits.

This portion of our society is just as much entitled to the protection of the laws as any other. It will be a sorry day for America when her farming industry shall show signs of decay. That portion of our population engaged in agriculture are at once the safety and the glory of our nation.

They are intelligent, conservative, patriotic. They are attached to the land and love their country with intense affection. They draw their substance directly from the bosom of mother earth, and so are most interested in preserving us against invasion or any other evil that may threaten us.

Shall this great and important portion of our population be abandoned in the adjustment of our tariff duties to the remorseless competition of wool-growers and flax-raisers of other lands, where labor or lands or both are cheaper? Or shall we preserve our magnificent markets for their use, and thus enable them to continue to hold their proud place among the toilers of America?

We want in this country no such one-sided monopolistic system as that which curses England, but we want rather to continue that system which encourages and builds up all industries and all labor, whether engaged in manufacturing or in producing the fruits of the field.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], while conceding that wages are higher in this country than in Europe, and trying to account for their being so, and trying to show that it is in no manner due to the protective tariff, makes a claim which seems to me to be absurd; one which he is not only unable to prove, but which he does not attempt to prove, and concerning which he is content to rely alone upon dogmatic assertion.

He says:

What, then, is it that makes higher wages? It is coal and steam and machinery. It is these three powerful agents that multiply the production of labor and make it more valuable.

He says further that fifty years ago it required five persons to make eight yards of cloth in one day, for which they received 20 cents each, or an aggregate of $1 for the five; that in a year the five persons produced 2,400 yards, but now, when coal, steam, and machinery are used, five persons in a year can produce 140,000 yards; that the result of the labor-saving machinery is an enormous increase in productive capacity, and that the result of that has been a great increase in the rate of wages. Why? How? In his own language, I ask the gentleman, "How can it be explained?" He does not condescend to tell us. Is not the statement ludicrous? A manufacturer employs five persons one day to work for him, for which he pays them $1. The next day, having at great expense to himself and the consequent employment of greatly increased capital, put in steam machinery, he pays the same five persons for one day's labor, which was no harder for them to perform, or any more skillful, than the work they did before, five or ten times as much wages. In other words, he makes a large outlay of capital, and instead of reaping the benefit himself he generously turns it all over to his workmen.

Surely in making this claim the gentleman pays the manufacturer a high compliment as a generous and benevolent man, not quite in keeping with his statement made a few moments before, that although a manufacturer may be able to pay higher wages, he does not do it. He says, "Unquestionably he is [able] but he does not do it." And he further emphasizes and also illustrates the argument by saying, Jay Gould is able to pay his bootblack $500 a day, and Mr. Vanderbilt his hostler $10,000 a year, but neither of them does it; but each goes out into the market and employs his man at the market price.

Neither is his claim that wages are made higher by coal and steam and machinery quite consistent with his other statement, made almost in the same breath, and which is a good deal more nearly correct, that wages are regulated by the "demand and supply and the capacity of the laborer to do the work for which he is employed."

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, at the risk of being inconsistent, puts the rate of wages on the true ground when he says that it depends upon the demand and supply. And it is because their rate depends upon the demand and supply that the protective tariff is instrumental in increasing them. It increases the demand. It does this by creating a wide diversity of employments. It stimulates the establishment and success of a great variety of manufactures, adapted to the varied talents, tastes, and opportunities of the working people, instead of confining them to one or a few industries to which they must adapt themselves or starve. And this answers, too, his question:

How is it that the wages in the different States of the Union are different, while the tariff is the same from Maine to California?

There is a demand for the employment of labor in a given industry only in that part of the country where that industry is carried on. A cotton factory in New England will not create a demand in Texas for spinners; nor will an iron mill in Alabama create a demand for puddlers in Maine. And right here lies the secret of the difference between wages generally in the South and in the North. In the North attention is paid to manufacturing of all kinds, while in the South in many parts, even where great natural advantages exist, no attention is given to the matter. In the North capital takes advantage of the opportunity afforded by a protective tariff and builds up manufacturing establishments, while in the South, from lack of capital or enterprise or from prejudice, and perhaps from all three, the opportunity afforded by the protection given by the tariff is not seized, and so no new demand for labor is created in that portion of the country, and of course, as a result, there being no new demand, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in his better moments, there is no advance in the price of labor.

But in some parts of the South light is breaking in. Some of her people, seeing the great material prosperity of the North, and seeing, too, the great advantages nature has conferred upon the South, have in some places invested their capital, aided by additional capital from the North, in manufacturing enterprises with great, and in many places, almost marvelous success. In Birmingham and Chattanooga and other places this has been done. Does the gentleman from Texas not believe that there is a greater demand for labor and for more kinds of labor in those cities than there was before such enterprises were established there? Has there not been an increased demand, and therefore an increased price?

It is only a question of time when the South, fully awaking from

her lethargy, will arouse herself, put forth her mighty strength, avail herself of her great advantages, seize the opportunity which the protective system affords her, erect factories, build up the waste places, employ her own raw materials and her vast supply of labor, and exceed in wealth and material prosperity anything that has yet been seen in America, and throw into insignificance by contrast her boasted days of greatness, when cotton was king and slavery was her corner-stone. May God speed the day when thus she will have fulfilled her destiny and the prophetic hopes of her early statesmen, who appreciated and advocated the doctrine of protection to American industries!

The gentleman from Texas includes among the three agents causing higher wages, machinery; but he does not tell us what has produced the machinery. How came the machinery he speaks of to exist? Clearly it came into existence in response to a demand for it. This, of course, everybody will admit. What created the demand for it? Clearly the demand for multiplied and cheapened processes of manufacturing goods for consumption. Why did methods of manufacturing goods need to be cheapened? Why, certainly because of the competition of manufacturers, each and all of whom were striving to possess the market by offering their wares cheaper than others.

How could these manufacturers, while thus competing and inventing machinery to cheapen their products, endure competition with the goods manufactured in Europe by cheaper labor? Surely only because they were protected by a protective tariff. Thus it was that the tariff afforded the inventors and improvers of machinery the opportunity and incentive to bring the same to the high state of perfection to which it has attained. In this manner it was that a protective tariff brought into existence the improved machinery, and so is entitled to the credit at one and the same time of creating the machinery of which the gentleman speaks and also enhancing the rate of wages.

Again, in reply to the claim of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that wages are higher in this country because of the use of coal and steam and machinery, I call his attention to the fact that in Europe, where low wages are, he will also find coal and steam and machinery, and find them cheaper, too, in many places, if not in all places, than in this country.

It is also an open secret that European manufacturers, especially the English, through agents whom they keep in this country constantly on the alert for anything new, buy up and ship to Europe every new and useful improvement in machinery; so that in the matter of machinery the shops in Europe are as well supplied as those of this country; and there is the best authority for the statement that there is no perceptible difference between the skill and speed with which machinery is operated in the best factories in Europe and America.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have not mentioned the only inconsistencies to be found in the position of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the others who with him are advocating this bill. They speak with vehemence and often with bitterness of the manufacturer. They say, in the language of the chairman, that "unquestionably" he is able when the value of his products is increased by protection to pay higher wages, but that he does not do it; that he has no regard for the laborers he employs; that he grinds them down; that he robs them of their fair share of the profits of the business in which he and they are engaged; that he is heartless, selfish, wicked; that while a protective tariff enables him to charge a large price for his products he pockets the entire benefit, and that his laborers get (in the language of the chairman of the committee) "not a dollar of it." And yet, Mr. Chairman, the advocates of this measure have been laboring for weeks to show, and that is the burden of their song, that to allow raw material to be introduced free will cheapen to the consumers the goods made out of such raw material; that if the manufacturer gets raw material cheaper he can afford to and will sell the manufactured product cheaper; and their offered consolation to the wool grower is, that while he will not get so much for his raw material, he will be enabled to buy his clothing enough cheaper to more than make up the difference in price.

What consistency! How is this to be brought about? Why, they tell us that the manufacturer getting his raw materials cheaper, will sell his goods cheaper; that he will be more considerate of the farmers than he will be of his own employés; that while cheaper wool will enable him to make more profit at the same price for the product, he will kindly and generously relinquish that increased profit, and give it to his customer, a stranger, while he will withhold a profit made under a protective tariff from his neighbor, his employé. In other words, that under a protective tariff he is a robber, but under free trade in his raw material he will "presto change" become a benefactor. "To this complexion" are the supporters of this measure come at last. It is an undignified, uncalled-for, and wanton attack upon a worthy class of American citizens. And that policy or system of fiscal legislation that requires a resort to such methods to sustain it and bolster it up, is unworthy of consideration in such a place as this, and unworthy the gentlemen who advocate it.

Oh, no; it is not true that our manufacturers as a class are robbers and extortioners. There may be, doubtless are, among them bad men, as there are in all walks of life, and as there may be even among the manufacturers of free-trade England, who have their raw materials placed at their disposal, in part, at public expense and the cost of the other classes in that country; but as a class they are as generous, as honest, as benevolent as other men. They, as a class, show and feel an interest in their employés, as is evidenced by efforts that they are constantly and voluntarily making in innumerable ways to better their employés' condition morally, intellectually, and physically, and above all, in their willingness, as statistics show, to constantly increase, as fast as able, their wages.

I am not saying, and do not say, that labor, even in America, is sufficiently rewarded. I do not believe that it is, except perhaps in a few branches. I believe that labor here and everywhere is entitled in many branches to a larger share in the results of its own exertions; and I long for the day when laborers from one end of the land to the other shall be rejoicing in higher wages; when they shall be able to enjoy more comforts and a greater degree of luxury even than they now enjoy; when, under the beneficent influence of a protective system, the branches of labor shall be so diversified and multiplied, and the consequent demand for workers shall be so increased throughout the land, South as well as North, that the toiler of whatever degree shall be in the enjoyment of all those good things of the earth that it is possible for him to enjoy and which it is profitable for anybody to enjoy.

I believe that the only system under which this "consummation so devoutly to be wished" can ever be realized is the protective system.

And, Mr. Chairman, at the same time that our tariff is thus enhancing the price of labor it is reducing the cost to our people of manufactured goods. We have the authority of Mr. Dudley, late consul at Liverpool, for this statement:

> Upon investigation it will be found that nine-tenths of the manufactured commodities used by the farmers of our country, including clothing, household goods, furniture, implements of husbandry, tools, etc., are as cheap in this country as they are in England, and in some instances even cheaper.

Again he says:

> An examination will show that there is not a single manufactured commodity, so far as I know, that is not cheaper to-day in the United States under our protective system than it was in 1860 under free trade, and before the present protective tariff went into operation.

But, Mr. Chairman, upon this latter point we do not need the testimony of Mr. Dudley. There are as many witnesses on this floor to the truth of what he says as there are members entitled to be here. Who is so ignorant or forgetful as not to know its truth? Who does not know that there is hardly a manufactured article of common use, of use by the middle classes and those who are poorer, that is not cheaper than before the tariffs of 1861 and 1867? Who is prepared to deny that carpets, furniture, implements of husbandry, the artisan's tools, books, newspapers, linens, woolens, cottons, prints, writing materials, carriages, wagons, hats, shoes, clothing, all things made of iron, plate-glass and all other glass, pottery, and many like articles are cheaper—some several hundred per cent. cheaper than before the war, and that very many of these things are now manufactured in this country which before were produced in foreign lands? And who does not know that while this is so, and notwithstanding the farmer's products are not for the time being bringing as good prices as they were a few years ago, they are for the most part sold for far more than they were before the war? In view of this condition of things, what becomes of all the fine-spun theories about the evils that protection will bring upon us, and of what avail are the distorted percentages in which our friends upon the other side so delight to deal?

These are facts which the common people can understand and appreciate, and which will not be hidden from their view by all the sophistries of all the free-traders or revenue-tariff tinkers in the land.

This cheapness of manufactured goods in this country and advance in the price of farm products must be ascribed to the tariff. How else can it be accounted for? If not to be credited to the tariff, it must at least be admitted that it coexists with the tariff; that the tariff does not militate against it. And if the tariff does not prevent this state of things, what harm in permitting it to remain?

But we are told by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that the rate of wages is higher in free-trade England than in Germany under her protective system, and then he asks, "Why is this?" But he forgets to say that while Germany has a protective system, she has had it only since 1879, and that since she adopted that system the rate of wages has steadily increased, as shown by the following table, which gives the increase for a period of five years, and which is an official statement carefully prepared by the Iron and Steel Association of the empire:

Items.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1882.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1883.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1884.
All works:			
Number employed	25.2	33.9	32.2
Total wages	42.0	57.2	52.1
Wages per employé	13.4	17.4	14.2
Iron and steel works:			
Number employed	23.5	26.9	26.3
Total wages	39.4	50.4	41.4
Wages per employé	12.9	18.5	11.8
Machine shops:			
Number employed	29.3	50.9	52.9
Total wages	48.3	73.6	82.0
Wages per employé	14.6	15.0	19.2

And as evidence that this desirable condition of things did not cease in 1884, the last year mentioned in the table, I quote the language of Mr. George Strachey, Her Britannic Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Dresden, as found in a recent report made by him to the British Government:

The belief is widely diffused that the tariff reform of 1879 saved Germany from great ruin, and that the empire is now on the road to industrial greatness, perhaps to the succession of that hegemony which Great Britain, it is thought, now with difficulty holds in her hands. Protection is in the national air and it will not be dissipated by foreign arguments, however accurately deduced from the axioms of scientific doctrine.

Mr. Strachey is not a protectionist, but a free-trader, and his testimony is not, therefore, that of a willing witness.

The fact is, that the wages in Germany in some industries have already in nine years of protection advanced from a point considerably below those paid in England to a point of equality with them.

THE ENGLISH SOLICITUDE.

A few years ago, in 1879, it is said by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], our English friends took alarm about the growth and development of our cotton industry, and sent an expert to the United States to inquire whether their industry was imperiled by ours. "He came, he saw," and returned, with the glad assurance to his people—

Be still, sad heart, and cease repining,
Behind the clouds the sun is still shining.

because, as the gentleman from Texas says, he found that the people of this country, while we could beat them in labor cost, like Ephraim, joined to our idols, and maintaining a high tariff on our raw materials, which would prevent our competing with the English. What raw material it was entering into the manufacture of cotton goods, the high tariff on which prevented our manufacturers from competing with those in England, he does not state; but no matter, it sounds well, and like many other free-trade arguments, being only "sound," "signifies nothing."

Now, will our friends upon the other side tell us why it is, if those experts who have been sent over here from England to "spy out the land" report that, owing to our tariff on raw materials, the English manufacturers are safe, there is so much anxiety in England over the passage of this bill? Will they tell us why it is that in 1880, the next year after the journey of the expert, the London Times said:

It is to the New World that the Cobden Club is chiefly looking, as the most likely sphere for its vigorous foreign policy. It has done what it can in Europe and is now turning its eyes westward and bracing itself for the struggle which is to come. It can not rest while the United States are unsubdued.

If the tariff on raw materials was preventing American manufacturers from competing with British manufacturers why was the Cobden Club, made up largely of those same manufacturers, seeking the repeal of the tariff?

If our tariff on raw materials stands in the way of our competing with the English manufacturers, as reported by this mythical expert, why do we find the following British papers using the following language in commenting upon the message:

[The Statist.]

There is hardly a single industry in the United States that is not interested in maintaining protective duties.

[People's Journal, Dundee.]

The change in the American fiscal policy will be beneficial to this country, and the prospect of it has diffused fresh hope throughout the business circles in the city.

[Haddingtonshire Courier, Scotland.]

We may look to an impetus being given to our home trade that will go far to make up for the depression of late years.

[The Scotchman.]

The free importation of iron, coal, and wool would be a great boon to British producers.

It looks a little, Mr. Chairman, as if imposition upon the credulity of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had not been confined to making him believe that seamless stockings could not be manufactured in America.

TRUSTS.

But, Mr. Chairman, many of the gentlemen who have advocated this bill have charged that protection fosters trusts, and that a large majority of that pestiferous brood have been organized to deal in or control so-called protected products. Not one of those who have made this assertion has proved or even assumed to attempt to show how protection is favorable to the formation of trusts. They have all been contented with the bald declaration. This form of argument may do for consumption in the districts or among the people represented by these gentlemen, but hardly goes for much here, where we are engaged in the important and responsible duty of trying to ascertain the truth and of shaping the fiscal legislation of sixty millions of people. If protection brings into existence these formidable combinations we want to know it, and that gentleman who can demonstrate it will earn the everlasting gratitude of an abused and anxious public.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that not one argument or illustration showing or tending to show that these trusts are the offspring of protection has been brought to our notice, there are many proofs to the contrary. The very fact that there is a single unprotected commodity which is the subject of a trust, demonstrates to my mind that protection is not essential; for if a trust can be formed to manipulate the market in one unprotected production, why may it not be to do the same in another and in all; and where, then, is the connection between its formation and the principle of protection? Why, the most gigantic of all trusts, the pioneer and model for all the others, the one whose success has been the inspiration (if anything so wicked can said to be inspired) of all the others, that consists of fifty or more different partnerships and corporations, of which the Standard Oil Company proper is but one—the one whose success and profits have far outstripped that of the Hudson Bay Fur Company, or the world-famous East India Company—the Standard Oil trust—manufactures, deals in, and substantially controls the market in a commodity upon which no protective tariff duty has ever cast its blight.

And this is not the only unprotected commodity controlled or sought to be controlled by a trust; large numbers of such articles are manipulated by them. And within a few days information has come to us over the wires that in the far West a farmers' trust, with a capital of $20,000,000, has been organized, of course for the purpose of controlling or trying to control the products of their industry—the very class of all who, the free-trade orators say, are not protected by our present tariff, but who are the victims of protection unjustly afforded to other industries at the farmers' expense, and to whom by far the greater part of the appeals of the supporters of this bill are directed.

Far be it from me, following after those who are so expert in making unsupported declarations, to assert that these trusts are the result of free trade in, or insufficient tariff protection of, the commodities in which any of them deal; but it would seem that those who are not, or who may fancy that they are not, sufficiently protected in their business would be the very ones to cast about for protection, and would seek to build up a barrier of some kind, to destroy or break down competition. I do not say that this is so; but I submit that there would be much more reason to expect it to be so than that those who our free-trade friends say are so highly protected by a tariff that they are growing immensely rich, and whom they so flippantly call "robbers" and "swindlers," would resort to it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if protection is the mother of trusts, how is it that they are found to exist in free-trade England?

Oh, no! Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be less disingenuous to inquire whether trusts are not simply another manifestation of that selfishness which exists, and always will exist, in the human heart; that inclination on the part of men engaged in business of any kind to seek advantage over their competitors; that tendency to overreach and thrive at the expense of others, that has been known, at least in rare cases, to invade even the kind and benevolent precincts of an English trader's heart, and has led him to force his odious fiscal and land laws upon impoverished Ireland and his opium trade upon an unwilling and unhappy people.

Would it not be as well to inquire whether a trust is really anything new under the sun; whether it is anything more than another form for the "combinations," "corners," "pools," and "rings" with which for years, reaching back of the enactment of the present tariff law, we have been familiar?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is all there is of it. And I believe, too, that the remedy for the evil does not lie in the destruction of the protective system, under which the country and the whole country has been so prosperous and under which thousands and millions, not members of a trust and who do not dream of becoming members of one, have prospered.

The remedy is rather to be found in State control. It is competent for the people of the respective States, and probably competent for them alone, to take away from partnerships or corporations organized under their laws the power to enter into such combinations, and thus prevent the evils arising from their creation. Then let this work be left with the authority constitutionally empowered to perform it, and let us perform the duty which devolves upon us—decide whether the country shall enter upon the road to ultimate free trade, or whether it shall continue its grand triumphant march on the highway of protection to American labor.

THE SURPLUS.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, states that on the 1st day of December last there was in the Treasury, after every possible obligation, including the sinking-fund requirements, had been provided for, the sum of $55,258,701.19, which was every day growing larger, and which would, as shown by a careful estimate, be increased on the 30th day of next month to $140,000,000.

We are informed by the same official that there has been each year for twenty-two years a surplus of revenue above current annual expenses, amounting during that time, which ended June 30, 1887, to the grand total of $1,491,845,953.12. What was done with this surplus by former administrations? Why, it was applied, except what was needed for permanent funds in the Treasury, as it should have been, to the reduction of the public debt. It never occurred to any former administration that while we were owing an enormous debt there was anything to be done with the annual surplus except to apply it to the payment of our indebtedness.

It was left to the one now in power to discover that there was great danger in the existence of a "surplus" much smaller than that which had been found to exist in each of several former years, and to make frantic appeals for its reduction by removal of tariff duties and gloomy prognostications of the dire results of a failure to do so.

Why is it that the present Administration has not, like its predecessors, applied its surplus to the payment of the bonded debt? It has had ample authority to do so by express provision of law, so plain that it would seem that he that runs might read, and one which this House has, by a two-thirds vote, declared to contain the authority. Why, then, has it not, without being driven to do so by the inexorable demand of public opinion, and by the voice of many of its supporters in this House, instead of endeavoring to alarm the money market, and so bring on a financial panic, gone about doing what any wise business man would have done—paid its debts with its surplus?

The reason is too evident. Having a pet theory to establish, wishing to bring about the adoption in this country of a free-trade system, it has not hesitated to use the assumed pressure of a plethoric and overburdened Treasury to force its peculiar views upon the people. In other words, it has abandoned its relation of servant of the people and assumed that of their guardian and master.

Mr. Chairman, let the Administration continue in the good work of redeeming the outstanding bonds at a large saving of interest, as it has been compelled to do against its will, and it will not be long before there will be no "surplus" to complain of, and in its place will be found a large decrease in the principal of the public debt, and consequent reduction in the interest burden upon the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, if for any reason this course should not be found practicable, or if unfriendliness to this method shall result in tardy action in this direction, the Democratic majority in this House can find ample ways to prevent the future accumulation of any surplus in the Treasury by wise expenditure of the money that shall come into it.

A bill has already been passed by the Senate of the United States, providing for the expenditure of $77,000,000 in eight years, in the education of the illiterate masses which will, if not enlightened, so dangerously threaten our peace during the coming years; a bill which a large majority of the members of this House would gladly vote for; but which, in obedience to the behest of the free-trade cabal that rules the Democratic majority, sleeps the sleep of death in the committee-room.

The dependent-pension bill, that act of tardy justice to the disabled defenders of the Union, is upon the Union Calendar of this House awaiting action. Pass it, and a large portion, if not all, of the so-called "surplus" will be distributed among the people, and one of our most sacred obligations will be discharged.

A service-pension bill, an act of justice to the survivors of the war, the passage of which the late Democratic convention of Indiana in a catch-vote mood so heartily indorsed, would dispose of a large portion, and perhaps all of the surplus revenue in the Treasury. I say "catch-vote mood," because the representatives of that party on this floor are supporting, and that same convention approved in another resolution, a policy which will make it impossible to pay the pension so indorsed.

Our coast defenses are calling for repairs and improvements, without which we are absolutely at the mercy of foreign nations; and this would require the expenditure of a large sum.

Our Navy is in great need of extension. The same necessity that exists for the erection and repair of coast defenses obtains with respect to the enlargement and increased efficiency of our Navy. In the event of a foreign war our Navy as at present constituted and provided would not be able to cope with those of even third-rate powers. To strengthen and improve our Navy, so that it would be able to enforce our rights on the high seas and protect our coast, would require an expenditure which would greatly reduce the "surplus."

Again, to refund to the States that paid them the direct taxes that were collected from them, and the retaining of which by reason of the refusal and neglect of the other States to pay their share has resulted in such a gross injustice, would take about $17,000,000 from the "surplus" and circulate it among the people.

To refund this money was so apparently an act of justice that three-fifths of the members of this House insisted upon doing it, through an eight days' continuous session, until enough of them, at the crack of the party whip, "took the back track" to indefinitely postpone the justice, and at the same time save the sacred "surplus."

But, Mr. Chairman, if we are not to pay our honest debts and liberal pensions, nor refund the direct tax, nor build and repair our coast defenses, nor increase our Navy, nor instruct our ignorance, and we are to reduce our revenue, the only question remaining is in what manner shall such reduction be accomplished. The President and a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means say it shall be done by a reduction of the duties on imports and the admission of certain articles now paying duties to the free-list.

The amount of the surplus for the current year is estimated at $113,000,000. I have attempted in my feeble way to show why this reduction should not be secured in the manner suggested by these gentlemen. It remains for me as an honest man, upon the responsibility resting in part upon me as a representative of the people, to give my views upon the way in which the flow of this surplus into the Treasury may be prevented.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad, if we are to reduce the revenues to current expenses, to see the whole internal-revenue system abolished. It is a system of taxation, pure and simple, and direct in its character, and one that has never been resorted to in this country except in emergencies. It is odious in its burdens and odious in the methods of its collection. Under it the tax-gatherer can enter and invade the privacies of homes and have admission to business men's most valued secrets. It accomplishes its end, and in many cases can only do so, by a system of espionage calling to its aid spies and emissaries.

The repeal of this system would dispose at once of the whole question of a supposed surplus. That surplus is estimated at $113,000,000. The income derived from the internal revenue last year was $118,000,000, which, less the expense of its collection, $4,000,000, would leave the reduction almost precisely equal to the surplus. It is to be observed further in this connection that this would also dismiss an army of officials, four thousand in number, and reduce the expenses of the Government $4,000,000 a year. What better way can be devised to settle this vexed question of a surplus than this? But it is said by the supporters of this bill that this would be leaving the burdens upon the necessaries of life and taking it off from the vices. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that this is the first time in the history of the Democratic party that they have been solicitous to keep burdens upon vice and relieve the necessaries. They are so anxious to place burdens upon vice that they are willing to burden the people with four millions of expense to do it. As is sometimes the case with other new converts, their zeal has got the better of their sense. If the Democratic party in its new-born zeal to reduce the cost of the necessaries, wishes to remove the burdens therefrom, why does it not admit sugar, that article of prime necessity that enters into the consumption every day of the poorest in the land, to the free-list? It pretends to be anxious to warm the poor man's body; why not also be anxious to sweeten his cup? The answer is too plain. It is for political reasons that this unjust discrimination is made. No Democrat can, nor has attempted to, explain it. It is not the only respect in which this bill is truckling, dishonest, cowardly, and sectional.

There is another reason why this tax should be removed from spirits and fermented liquors. The matter of taxing the liquor traffic should be left with the States, the only authority that can, under our Constitution, as a police regulation, impose a tax upon the traffic as distinguished from the liquors themselves. The General Government should not in any manner stand nor seem to stand in the way of the proper exercise of this power by the States to eradicate this great evil from the land, except in the event of a dire necessity, like a war or the resulting necessity for large revenue to pay the cost of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, while this would be my way of preventing the accumulation of a surplus, I am not unwilling to vote for any other method upon which a majority can agree that will at the same time continue in force without any impairment the principle of protection to American labor.

I am willing to vote in a spirit of harmony and compromise for the repeal of all the internal revenue derived from the tax on tobacco and cigars and the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in those articles, the tax on spirits used in the arts, and the duty upon sugar. This would, less the amount of a sugar bounty, of which I shall speak, reduce the income ninety-five millions which is perhaps as large a reduction as can safely be made.

To repeal the duty on sugar, under the circumstances, would be no violation of the principle of protection to home industries, since the experience of the past demonstrates that there can not be produced in this country from cane above 10 per cent. of our consumption of this article, owing to climatic and other reasons that will continue to exist. When it is impossible, in the nature of things, to produce an amount of any article of common consumption nearly equal to that consumption, that is not one of those articles that should be protected by a tariff, any more than an article which we can not produce in any quantity. There are of late, however, indications that owing to new inventions and discoveries the manufacture of sugar from beets and sorghum may prove successful, and may yet, with proper encouragement, equal the great demand in this country.

I would, therefore, while removing the duty from this article, provide for a bounty which would sufficiently protect the cane-sugar industry, and at the same time stimulate the experiments which are now promising so much in the way of the production of surgar from sorghum and beets.

But, Mr. Chairman, to return to a subject which I have already touched. We have a public debt of nearly twelve hundred millions. When, I ask the gentlemen upon the other side, do they propose to pay that? If there is to be no income beyond current expenses, when can that be paid? More than two hundred millions of the bonded debt fall due in 1891, now close at hand. How shall they be met at maturity? I suppose our friends upon the other side would say, by making a new loan. But are they in favor of indefinitely continuing our debt? Do they believe that "a public debt is a public blessing?" Do

they want to follow in the footsteps of Great Britain and have and forever continue a public loan? The alacrity with which they favor the English idea of free trade may well create the suspicion that they are also willing to continue indefinitely our public debt, because that, too, is "English, you know."

For myself, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I am in favor of a continuance of the policy of the Republican party, of paying our debts until the last cent of them shall be liquidated; not only those that are bonded, but those other large amounts that are equally as sacred. And the American people, too, are in favor of this policy. They always have been, and have given no sign of a change of opinion. Not a petition has come up to this House during this session of nearly six months' duration asking for any change. A great deal has been said about the burdens of taxation resting upon the people and the necessity for removing them. I call the attention of the American people to a fact which perhaps, owing to the clamor of the Democratic politicians, has escaped their attention, that not a single person has asked this Congress by petition to reduce taxation by a reduction or repeal of tariff duties. Not one. The RECORD will fail to disclose that a single petition has been introduced for that purpose. There could be no stronger evidence that all this talk about the people's groaning under their burdens of taxation has no foundation. It all emanates from the brains of politicians who see the handwriting on the wall that their party has been "weighed in the balance and found wanting," and who are casting about for some issue or party shibboleth with which they may make an attempt to hoodwink the people into intrusting them again with political power.

And, Mr. Chairman, while there is such a dearth of petitions for the passage of the Mills bill, or any similar measure, the record of the proceedings of this House discloses the fact that thousands upon thousands of our people, in all walks of life, but especially those engaged in labor, are, by petitions addressed to us, crying out and protesting against its passage. To all these prayers the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means turn a deaf ear; they give these people no hearing; but, taking counsel alone of the demands of their own political fortunes, they insist upon saying to these people, "You don't know what you want. We alone are able to determine that. What you need is not a continuation of our own American system, but its destruction, and the erection upon its ruins of a foreign system, for which, while it is true you do not ask for it, every English manufacturer and every English ship-owner is devoutly praying; and this being an English administration, to them alone do we give ear."

Mr. Chairman, a vast amount of valuable time has been occupied in the course of this debate by those advocating this bill in the vain attempt to show that the placing of wool upon the free-list will not injure the producers of wool. The same men who say this complaim that a duty upon any other manufactured article than wool—and wool is a manufactured article—enhances the profits upon that article to its manufacturer. If it does, why not also to the producer of wool? If a duty will give more profit to one manufacturer, why not to another? To an ordinary mind this question is unanswerable. Even some of those rending the air for free wool admit that the duty does enable the wool-grower to make a better profit; but they say if he will only let them take the duty off he can buy his woolen clothes enough cheaper to make up the difference. If taking the duty off would have the effect thus claimed, how many wool-growers are there raising so small an amount of wool that the difference in the price of their woolen clothing would equal the profits they would lose upon their wool? An exceedingly small number, indeed.

It takes not over 6 pounds of wool to make a suit of heavy clothing for a man. It does not take as much for a woman; but assuming that it does, an average family, say one of five persons, would thus gain at 12 cents, the highest duty per pound upon the 30 pounds of wool required to furnish each of them a good suit of woolen clothing for each year, the sum of $3.60. The President in his remarkable message says that a large proportion of the sheep owned by the farmers are found in small flocks, numbering from twenty-five to fifty. It is my observation that a very small portion of the sheep-owners of the country have only twenty-five. I believe that the average would not be less than seventy-five. But suppose the average to be only fifty. According to the President the enhanced value of their wool would be, because of the tariff, $36. Thus we find that the increased cost of clothing of the farmer, because of the tariff, is $3.60, while his increased profit is $36. In other words, that his profit, by reason of the tariff, is just ten times his loss by it. Now, I have made no allowance for blankets for the family of the sheep-owner. Suppose he bought two blankets a year, weighing 5 pounds each, which would be a liberal estimate, his entire tax, by reason of the wool tariff, would be only $1.80; but to be entirely safe, suppose we double the amount of wool required, we would then have a tax of $9.60, an amount equal to only about one-fourth of the farmer's profit on his wool.

Now, all this is on the theory that the amount of the tariff is added to the cost to the consumer of the article upon which it is levied, while our experience shows that woolens are produced almost as cheaply under the tariff as they can be produced in England, and the President's argument falls to the ground. Even while I am speaking, an all-wool business suit for a man, cut in the latest fashion, elegantly made, and fit for any man to wear, can be bought in the shadow of this Capitol for $10, and coarser styles for proportionately lower sums—prices that certainly refute all argument to the effect that a tariff begets high prices to the consumer.

And when, as has been shown upon this floor without dispute, a pair of blankets of precisely the same weight and quality as those which cost in England $4.45, and upon which tariff duties and charges of $4.90 are levied, making a total of $9.35, are sold in this country at $5.20, it is about time for the President and his co-workers in this House, and for everybody else, to cease making the monstrous claim that the tariff laws "raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties."

Now, if the argument addressed to wool-growers that they can buy their clothing enough cheaper to make up for their loss on the price of their wool is a good one, why is it not equally as good applied to any other producers—to the manufacturers of all the multiplied articles which human ingenuity and industry can produce for the comfort or use of man? Why apply it to wool alone? And if it can be applied to all those industries as well as to wool, why does not the argument result logically in free trade, when all the expenses of the Government shall be raised by a direct tax and the custom-houses shall be abolished? Some of the gentlemen on the other side, not seeing any escape from this logic, accept it as good and boldly avow themselves as in favor of free trade. They are the consistent ones. The argument of the President as certainly ends in ultimate free trade as any conclusion ever resulted from a major and minor premise; and, Mr. Chairman, if the people of this country are ever deluded or driven or persuaded, or dragged by their political leaders into the support of this bill, those leaders will be justified in taking further steps towards free trade, as they can well plead as an excuse that the people have declared in favor of such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in vain during the debate for one expression from that portion of the Democratic majority upon the floor of this House who are most vigorously demanding the passage of this bill, to wit, the gentlemen representing the cotton belt, of sympathy for the cause of labor; for the expression of a single desire for the advancement of the cause of labor; for any commendation of this bill because it will enhance the price of labor or better the condition of the laborer. Why is this? The advocates of protection on this floor say that protection will increase the price of labor, and give that as one of the strongest reasons for their support of the system; but the gentlemen from the extreme South, while denying that protection will do what its friends claim, yet sing no peans to labor, speak no good word for it, express no solicitude for its welfare. On the contrary, one of those gentlemen has stated, during this debate, that he wants not only cheap goods, but an opportunity to procure cheap labor; and another, the accomplished and able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], announces and adheres to the exploded doctrine that no warrant can be found in the Constitution for the protection of labor.

Mr. Chairman, do not these gentlemen thus ignore the claims of labor because they mistakingly conceive the cheapening of labor to be in their interest and that of their constituents? Do they not wish to keep the insufficient remuneration of labor at the low ebb where it now stands in the South that they may be able to raise their cotton, rice, and sugar at the lowest possible cost, and thus increase their profits on those commodities? This I believe to be the reason of their ignoring of labor. They stand in the same position that their free-trade predecessors of *ante bellum* days occupied. Their chief object was to procure cheap food and clothing for their slaves who performed their labor. The desire of those who follow them is now, since slavery has been abolished, to procure the labor of their former slaves at the lowest possible figure. Consequently they wish to see no general advance in the price of all kinds of labor, which would surely follow the establishment in the South of manufacturing industries under the beneficent ægis of a protective system.

The funny member from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN], as a part of his remarks, introduced and presumably indorsed a long screed in the form of part of a letter from one Dr. B. F. Ward, of Mississippi, whoever he is (a near relative, judging from his "amoozing" production, of the late Artemus), in which the assumed virtues and greatness of the South and the shortcomings and unimportance of the North are set forth in terms as glowing as untruthful.

That part of the letter introduced is as follows. I introduce it again that the people of my district and my section may have further opportunity to understand the animus and present attitude of the unreconstructed rebels of the South and their representatives on this floor:

No careful observer will probably deny that among the wealthy and fashionable classes at the North there is more idleness and extravagance, more folly and arrogance, more dissipation and vice, and a more impassable barrier between rich and poor than ever existed in the most opulent social circle of slave-holders. For however aristocratic they may have been, they were always courteous and refined. In the North the tendency to divide society on financial lines has grown with constantly increasing intensity for more than half a century, until now it is almost definitely established. The very rich and very poor are as widely separated as Dives and Lazarus. In the old South, on the contrary, there were processes constantly at work, effecting a gradual and steady diffusion of wealth, which preserved in a great measure the homogeneity of society.

Prominent among the agencies were the matrimonial alliances so often contracted between the families of the rich and poor. In fact, it was the rule for the active, intellectual, ambitious young men from the poorer families to marry the daughters of wealthy planters. Instead of attempting to restrain these alliances they were generally encouraged by wealthy parents, with a view to preserving the physical and mental vigor of their families without sacrificing their estates. To employ a homely but expressive phrase, "brains and money were constantly combining" to build up and preserve in the old South the finest society in the world, to the exclusion of those twin evils, the millionaire and the tramp.

The fine moral and intellectual organization of Southern children has heretofore been largely due to the fact that their mothers were exempt from the hardships of physical drudgery and the depressing effects of impending want. The poorest man in the South supported his family with comparative ease, because of the gently rising gradations in society and the universal liberality of the stronger toward the weakest. How is it in those countries so long freed from the "curse of slavery," but where mechanical invention is progressively increasing the congestion of wealth and stimulating luxurious living among the rich, while it alarmingly swells the ranks of the hungry laborer, the socialist, and the pauper? Take Massachusetts, the "hub" of free schools, free labor, and boasted intelligence, as a fair representative. The average expenses of laboring men who are the heads of families in Massachusetts amount to $754.42, while their earnings average $558.68. In other words, the workingman falls short of a support for his family $195.74, or 32 per cent. It is wrung from the toil of the mother and children, not through the discharge of the ordinary domestic duties of woman's sphere, but in the wages mill.

One-third of the enterprises of great pith and moment, rather than the nursery of scribblers. She has made history for others to write and sell. She has carved with the sword the pathway of the pen and made America the stronghold of the Anglo-Saxon race. The first resolutions declaring the right of the colonies to be "free and independent" were introduced into a Southern legislature by a Southern man. The first resolutions to the same effect were presented in the Colonial Congress by another Southern man, and took form and consistence in the Declaration of Independence, under the matchless genius of still another Southern man. A Southern man led the patriot armies to victory, and established the possibilities of the proudest nation on the earth. A Southern man was prime mover of the convention that framed the Constitution. When the Government had been created its organic law was still an unexplained book, a ponderous oar in unskilled hands.

It was left for the greatest legal mind of the age, a Southern Chief-Justice, to analyze and stamp upon it the construction which will be accepted as long as the Constitution is respected. A Southern man framed the ordinance for the organization and government of the great Northwestern Territory, an instrument second in importance only to the Constitution of the United States. A Southern man was the author of the republican theory of popular government which prevailed during the sixty years of our greatest prosperity, peace, and happiness. Of the fifteen Presidents of the Continental Congress, eight were from slave States. From 1789 to 1853, a period of sixty-four years, embracing eleven administrations, the slave States furnished eight Presidents, whose terms of service covered fifty-two years.

During the same time the free States furnished three Presidents, whose combined terms covered twelve years. Of twelve Vice-Presidents, four were from slave States. Under these eleven administrations the slave States supplied fourteen Secretaries of State, eleven Secretaries of War, six Secretaries of the Treasury, nine Secretaries of the Navy, and eight Postmaster-Generals. Of fifty-five Presidents *pro tempore* of the Senate, thirty-one Speakers of the House, twenty-two were from slave States. Of five Chief-Justices two, and the only two of great eminence, were from slave States. Of twenty-nine Associate-Justices, seventeen were from slave States. Of twenty-one Attorney-Generals, fourteen were from slave States. Of one hundred and eighty-five public ministers to foreign countries, ninety-nine were from slave States.

Without going further into exhaustive details, for which material is abundant and overwhelming, we affirm, without fear of decent denial, that along the lines of these fifty-two years are ranged all the broad and lofty conceptions of statesmanship, all the bold and fruitful enterprises, all the grand and comprehensive achievements from which have evolved the pride, the power, and the glory of the American people.

The war of 1812 was scarcely less important in its results than the war of independence. The one left us an embryonic nation; the other developed full-grown power, wiping out the results of twenty-five years, planting our flag upon the ocean, and dissolving every doubt in the minds of foreign powers that we were a Government *de facto*, and entitled to a place in the front rank of nations. This war, we are told by a Northern historian, "was a Southern measure for the protection of Northern interests;" yet it was inaugurated and pressed to a triumphant issue under the administration of a Southern slaveholder, supported by a "solid South," in the face of the almost solid opposition of the free States. Who were the master spirits of that struggle? Such men as Clay, Calhoun, Monroe, Grundy, Lowndes, and Crawford; while only five Senators north of the Delaware voted to sustain it.

In the gloomiest and most critical days of the conflict, New England, which "writes all the books," was holding a secession convention, denouncing the war and intriguing with the emissaries of Great Britain. As a consequence, when England sent her powerful fleet to invest our ports, she exempted the coast of New England from the operations of the blockade. When the success of the war had established its popularity in the free States, a Southern man formulated the financial policy which extinguished its immense debt in less than twenty years.

Under these same "slothful and demoralizing" auspices of slavery the great Indian wars were fought, their magnificent country opened to white settlement, the savages removed, and measures adopted for their civilization. Florida was acquired from Spain, and from France that vast domain, the Louisiana Territory, comprising more than one million square miles, greater in extent and richer in resources than the whole territory of the then existing United States, and giving us the sole ownership of the Mississippi River from its sources to the Gulf. This one achievement, conceived and accomplished by a Southern President, through the supreme skill and courage of a Southern diplomatist, overshadows in its stupendous proportions, outweighs in the vastness of its results every national measure presented by Northern statesmanship and secured by Northern enterprise since the landing at Plymouth Rock. It was this far-reaching stroke of Southern diplomacy which elicited from the great Napoleon the prophetic remark that the "acquisition of Louisiana forever strengthens the power of the United States and gives to England a maritime rival that will some day humble her pride."

The war for the independence of Texas and the administration of its government by its Southern Presidents was another manifestation of the "slothful energies" of the "dependent idlers" and "overseers." The war with Mexico and the annexation of Texas were assailed by the free States with the same vehement opposition which they had presented to the last war with England; but a Southern President again held the helm, the pluck and patriotism of the "gentlemen idlers" once more prevailed, and Columbia took in her embrace the giant of whom it has been graphically said: "If Texas were laid on the face of Europe, with the head resting on the mountains of Norway, one palm covering London and the other Warsaw, it would stretch across the kingdom of Denmark, across the empires of Germany and Austria, across Northern Italy, and bathe its feet in the Mediterranean."

It is capable of producing 12,000,000 bales of cotton and will have a cattle range left larger than the whole State of New York. This war, prosecuted by the enervated, non-progressive "overseers," gathered into the national domain also the Territory of New Mexico, itself larger than the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; extended the national boundary to the Pacific, and opened to the world the Golden Gate of California.

Mr. Tillet, in his haste to elevate the new South by degrading the old, forgets that most of the representative men of the new South, her Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, governors, judges, jurists, leading journalists, college professors, eminent divines, and successful men of business in every line were born and educated under the "curse of slavery." There is no new South. The term is a misnomer and a myth. It is simply a phrase costume in which old prejudices masquerade through modern prints, seeking to pervert the education of Southern children into the conviction that their ancestors, if not criminal, were little more than a race of "idiots," blunderers, blockheads, and failures. But the present or future generations will never find reason to be ashamed of the brainwork of the old South.

He tells us that the wealthy families in the South, with a view to preserving the physical and mental vigor of their families without sacrificing their estates, encouraged matrimonial alliances between their daughters and the sons of the poor. That the vigor, physical and mental, of the wealthy families of the South needed the infusion of new blood from some outside source, I am not prepared to deny, but he fails to tell us what alliances were provided for the sons of the rich. They seem to have been overlooked. Or were their alliances not matrimonial, but contracted outside the pale of that sacred relation, and between them and their bondwomen? The tell-tale bleaching complexions of the African race in the South only too plainly answer this question. Who wonders that the families of the rich in the South needed more mental and physical vigor?

Brains and money were constantly combining, he says, to build up and preserve in the South the finest society in the world "to the exclusion of those twin evils, the millionaire and the tramp." The arrogance of this claim is only equaled by its oblivion of the combination that existed between brains and the greed for money to build up and preserve slavery, that "twin relic of barbarism."

This same reliable gentleman tells us in his remarkable letter that all the brains, all the patriotism, all the moral worth of the country in the early days of the Republic were found in Southern men; but he forgets to point out which one of them all was from the cotton States, that section to which he belongs, and which is attempting, by the passage of this bill, to fasten upon the whole country the infamous labor-impoverishing system of English free trade.

He does not remind us that of all the splendid galaxy of great men who introduced into a Southern Legislature the first resolutions declaring the right of the colonies to be "free and independent," who presented the first resolutions to the same effect in the Colonial Congress, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, who led the patriot armies to victory, who were the prime movers of the convention that formed the Constitution, who stamped upon the Constitution the construction which will be accepted as long as the Constitution is respected, and who framed the ordinance of 1787, not one was from the cotton States of the Union, not one from that portion of the South denominated "solid," where elections are a farce, and where Representatives on this floor are, with few exceptions, recorded as coming with "no opposition," by a vote in many instances less than one-tenth of the legally authorized constituency. He is also careful to omit mention of the glorious part which his own State has taken in all the grand achievements of the country's history.

He does not mention the name of one "illustrious son" of Mississippi who, possessed of that "fine moral and intellectual organization" of which he prates, has shed any luster on our country. Has this Mr. Ward, or has the gentleman from Mississippi, the name of one to give us? Why is it that while the South has been making "history for others to write and sell" the State of Mississippi has received in that history no mention worthy of record, except that she repudiated her honest debts, and was the home of the only president of the only Confederacy ever organized to destroy that Constitution which this braggart in his letter boasts Southern men framed, established, and construed?

But the "apex of audacity," to use the language of another, is reached by this scribbler, when, as a stigma upon the fair fame of the North, he repeats the stale and long ago exploded lie that the Hartford convention was a "secession convention," and when the only "secession conventions" ever held were in those States, including his own, which through him are arrogating to themselves all the virtue and greatness and patriotism in the land.

While recounting the glories of the "old South," as he is pleased to call it, why does he finish his record at 1853? Is he ashamed of the part the "Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, governors, judges, jurists, leading journalists, college professors, and eminent divines," "born and educated under the curse of slavery" have taken in the period since that year? Is he not equally as proud of the glorious part "Southern men" have taken in that period of our glorious history as of that period to which he confines his praise? Is it strange, Mr. Chairman, that a man who thus extols slavery, and the system of society which it created and fostered, should protest against anything "new," and declare that there is no "new South," and that the term is simply a "phrase costume?"

It is just such men as this that have kept and are trying to keep the South in the shadow of the past; who constantly wave the "bloody shirt" and get mad because they can not have a monopoly of the business; who refuse to look forward, but have always their eyes towards the rear of the procession. It is not strange that the South should be so slow to avail herself of the benefits of the American system of protection to labor when men who are capable of writing such stuff are complimented on this floor as "distinguished citizens" and their productions are read and indorsed by honorable representatives from that section.

Mr. Chairman, I deny the imputations implied in the attempt of this letter to belittle the part taken by the men of the North in securing and maintaining our liberties. Her great names come trooping into my memory. Her Adamses, Franklins, Morrises, Schuylers, Shermans, Warrens, Hamiltons, Jays, Livingstons, and a host of others make up the noble array. Their deeds I do not need to recount; they are written on the glorious pages of imperishable history. And I am reminded that while it may be true that men of the South were the first to pass resolutions (and I honor their memory), men of the North were the first to act, and the first to seal their devotion by shedding their blood in defense of American independence.

I have only disgust and contempt for the fulsome twaddle in which this man talks about the "fine moral and intellectual" superiority of the men of the South over those of the North, and the sneers with which he speaks of the "hungry laborer, the socialist, and the paupers" of the North. It smacks of the sentiment so prevalent in the days of the "old South," that the farmers of the North were the "mudsills" of society and the mechanics were "greasy," so often and so defiantly flung into the faces of the patient freemen of the North before the days when it was demonstrated that it took more than one of those Southern cavaliers to whip five "mudsills" and "greasy" mechanics, and when it became necessary for those same "mudsills" and "mechanics," by their prowess and devotion to human liberty, on a thousand fields, to defend that Constitution which only Southern men established and construed, against the deadly assaults of their descendants.

Mr. Chairman, free-trade writers and orators are given to gloomy prognostications of impending ruin. But somehow such forecasts have always proved to be the mistaken utterances of trembling fear, and have never been realized. Many of those who stand high in the councils of the free-traders have been thus unfortunate in their prophecies.

Hon. David A. Wells, in a speech delivered by him in Cooper Institute, in November, 1883, and in which he claimed that protection had so stimulated manufacturing in this country that the home market was overstocked, and until free trade should come to our relief we should go on from bad to worse, said:

> Things will grow worse until, through wreck and disaster, the home domestic manufacturing production is forced down into correspondence with or below the requirements for domestic consumption, unless in the mean time, through a change in our national fiscal policy, other and larger markets and outlets for our present surplus product can be opened, or some special providence, like famine or war in the Old World, comes to temporarily help us out of our dilemma.

Well, neither foreign war nor famine has come to our relief; there has been no change in our fiscal policy, nor has there been any forcing down of production; but, on the contrary, many more manufacturing establishments have been commenced, and the production from shops and farms has been largely increased, and no "wreck and disaster" have come, and we are more prosperous and wages are higher and goods are more in demand than then. The fact is, and one which Mr. Wells in the same speech admits, that at that time there was, as all will remember, a general stagnation in business throughout the civilized world, including even free-trade England, from which our country, owing to the fiscal policy of which Mr. Wells complains, has recovered more rapidly and more surely than the nations of the Old World.

Again, he said in the same speech:

> A continuation of the causes and policy which restricts our American manufacturer merely to the domestic market for the sale of his products and debars him in a great degree from access to foreign markets, inevitably means, therefore, low wages and the degradation and impoverishment of the masses, or insures the very results which it is claimed a high-tariff policy is certain to avert.

Well, nearly five years have elapsed, and while the policy of which he complains has continued we have not had low wages nor degradation and impoverishment of the masses, but, on the contrary, an advance in wages and the opposite of degradation and impoverishment of the masses.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of the free-trader and of the advocates of this bill, it seems to me, is a sordid dollar-and-cent argument. It rises to no great height. It has to do only with the question, How much cheaper can I buy a suit of clothes or a pair of shoes. It does not take a comprehensive and patriotic view of the situation. It does not ask what is the best thing for the country as a whole, but what is best for me as an individual. It does not occupy the standpoint of the country's glory, of its increase in wealth and power, of the multiplication of its industries. It does not take an account of America as standing by herself and for herself. It does not appeal to our patriotism, but to our love of money. It expresses no desire to see the price of labor enhanced, but drivels about cheaper clothing for those who have first to earn their money before they can buy clothing, either cheap or dear.

It does not glory in a system of our own, but has its eye fixed upon the system of a foreign people no more adapted to our situation than is that same people's government to our free Constitution. In short, it looks backwards and not forwards. It would foist upon a young, vigorous, progressive, and free people the old, worn-out, effete, impoverishing, and class-preferring system of a country whose rich are ever growing richer and whose poor are ever growing poorer. It is not the argument that the American people will listen to. It is not the argument that a people who unhesitatingly assumed the expenditure of $10,000,000,000 and the sacrifice of half a million of valuable lives to sustain and enforce a great principle will appreciate. They still love that country they sacrificed so much to save, and are looking forward to her greater and grander glory, when her people, through and by means of her beneficent protective system—her own American system—shall surpass the prosperity and happiness which they have already achieved, and stand unrivaled in the world's history in all that constitutes a people's greatness.

And now, Mr. Chairman, what is our duty as representatives and patriots? Shall we, in response to the demands of *doctrinaires*, and in the face of our experience, abandon a policy under which we have advanced from a third-rate to a first-rate power; under which we have undergone a complete industrial revolution; under which we have emerged from a condition of comparative obscurity to the proud position among the nations typified by the magnificent figure, with torch in hand shining a hundred miles out to sea, of "Liberty Enlightening the World;" under which we quelled the greatest rebellion recorded in history; under which we have more rapidly and more easily paid the enormous debt incurred thereby than could any other nation ever organized among men; under which labor has more liberty, more rights, more comforts, more power than under any other government on the earth; under which religion is freer, truth more untrammeled, freedom more assured, and wealth more diffused than among any other people?

Shall we continue the policy of keeping American markets for American labor, and so foster our own industries and build up our own greatness, or shall we return to our condition before all this greatness and glory came upon us, to that condition always following free-trade legislation, and surrender to England our independence and prosperity?

To these questions for myself I have but one answer. I stand for the toilers of America, their continued and increasing prosperity, and the consequent glory of my country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, in considering the subject covered by this bill we are addressing ourselves to a duty which in every age has been the most important that has devolved on the representatives of the people. Inherent in the very idea of human government, no matter under what system, no matter how crude or how perfect, is the principle that each individual member must make some contribution to a common fund to be used for the common good.

Every individual who is worthy to become a member of organized society, known as government, will cheerfully make this contribution just so long as he feels that the amount exacted approximates a fair distribution of the common burdens among those to be benefited, and no longer.

The methods by which these contributions are gathered into the common fund, no matter how simple or how complex; no matter how harsh or how insidious in their operation; no matter whether paid in hard cash out of the citizen's pocket, or by the sale of his property by a collector, or concealed in the enhanced price of what he eats, drinks, or wears, constitute taxation.

It certainly goes without saying that under our boasted free government, whose people we are representing in our deliberations on this bill, both the methods and measure of taxation ought to be just and equal to every citizen wherever be his home or whatever be his occupation. However much we may differ on other propositions; however difficult it may be for the member on this side of the House to convince the member on that side that when the consumer has paid $1.47 for an article that it cost only $1 to produce he is poorer than he would have been had he bought it for the $1; and however difficult it may be for the member on that side to convince this side that the man who paid the extra 47 cents received a blessing in disguise; however persistently and vociferously and ingeniously the tax-eater may plead with the tax-payer that both are made richer by the peculiar twist of the wrist by which this operation was performed; however doggedly the tax-payer may insist that the emptiness of his pocket is none the less real because his money was taken by a process which he was led to believe would fill rather than empty his purse! however much we may debate these questions, I venture the assertion that no man in this Hall or out of it will be found to say that the burdens of the Government, like its blessings, ought not to fall equally on all the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is fortunately one other proposition upon which we can all agree. Much adverse criticism of the President's bold, fearless, and manly message has been indulged in, both in this and in the other end of the Capitol, and in the press, by the representatives of those whose "business interests," as they style their right under the existing laws to levy contribution on the necessaries of life, they say will be disturbed if this bill passes. At first some were even bold enough to say that there ought to be no reduction of taxation;

that instead of reduction of taxation there ought to be expansion of expenditure to get rid of the surplus; that the representatives of the people ought to be as fertile in expedients to squander the surplus as they had been in expedients to collect it; that they ought to be able to find or invent some new drain by which an overflowing Treasury might be emptied. With them it mattered not how or where the money was expended, so it was expended, and the necessity for tax reduction averted. But this idea was advanced cautiously to ascertain whether the people would submit to having their money thus squandered. An unmistakable negative response from the press and the people has warned the opponents of revenue reform that the people stand guard over this avenue of escape from the duty they owe their constituents, and have promised time and again to discharge—to reduce taxation.

So that now I believe I am justified in saying that no member on that side of the House, however he may hate to see the pruning-knife of revenue reform applied, however much he may resist reduction of taxation, will dare to rise in his seat and say that more money is not collected from the people than ought be collected, or that the remedy for this surplus is not to reduce taxation and leave the money in the pockets of the people, where it belongs. Hence I say that upon this proposition we are all agreed, that the way to prevent a surplus is to reduce taxation. I know that is the unanimous judgment of this side of the House, and if any one of my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle believes now that the surplus ought not be reduced by reducing taxation, I would like to have him announce that fact as part of the platform on which he asks his constitutents to return him to this House.

Then, Mr. Chairman, agreeing that taxes ought to be reduced, how much and on what ought they be reduced? Ought they be reduced so as to relieve the tax-payers of the most possible or of the least possible of the burdens that taxation necessarily brings? Shall the reduction be made in the interest of those who lose by taxation or in the interest of those who gain by taxation? Shall the reduction be made at the dictation of the gentlemen on the other side of this House who represent those who receive largely more of the amount paid by the people than the Government itself, or shall it be made under the direction of gentlemen on this side of the House who represent those who are appealing to have some part of a ruinous and unnecessary burden rolled off their shoulders?

In short, shall we repeal internal-revenue taxes, every dollar of which is levied on luxuries and when collected goes into the Federal Treasury, or shall we reduce tariff taxation, less than one dollar of which out of four paid reaches that Treasury, the other three going into the pockets of the manufacturing capitalists, corporations, and trusts, for whom, attempt to disguise the fact as they may, our Republican friends are making the fight on this floor? I shall not stop now to discuss the question whether this three-fourths of the enormous toll gathered by these manufacturing capitalists, combines, and trusts, while the Government gathers one-fourth, is ever, by a peculiar process of legerdemain which no human being has ever yet been able to understand, voluntarily transferred from the pockets of these charitable capitalists back to the pockets of the laboring men and farmers whence it was taken. I leave that question for the manufacturing laborer, struggling with capital and Pinkerton's armed detectives for enough of his hard earnings to keep want and hunger from the door of his cabin, to answer. I leave the answer to that question to the Western and Southern farmer, competing single handed and unprotected in the markets of the world against the cheapest labor in the world with his wheat and cotton for enough money to pay the annual interest on the mortgages that tariff-fatted capital has fastened on his humble home. But we are asked to believe that capitalists are honest and liberal and magnanimous, and generous, and just. Only get the tribute of protection into their pockets and they will divide liberally with the farmer and the laborer. They must exercise faith in the generosity and liberality of the capitalists. Nobody can see how they get back their share of this tribute which consumption pays to manufacturing production, but they are asked to trust.

For myself, Mr. Chairman, I have come to loathe and despise the word "trust," as applied to wrongs now committed under that name. I believe that if it was within the scope of legislation I would vote for a bill to strike it from the English language.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my short service on this floor heard from this side of the House some of the severest arraignments of trusts. Indeed, I wish to be just and say that through this debate, when driven to the wall, many of our friends on the other side of the House have disclaimed any desire to legislate in the interest of trusts.

But, sir, there is one trust; a legalized trust; a forced trust; a trust by which the farmer and the laborer, the blood, the bone, sinew, and intellect; the sweat and toil that produce wealth, is by law compelled to make, not the natural and voluntary, but an unnatural and unequal combination with capital, which is only wealth already produced. This combine, under the forms of law, compels labor, whether on the farm, or in the shop, or at the loom, to pay to capital as its trustee almost one-third of its hard earnings, 47 cents out of every $1.47, under the guise that in some mysterious way, and after it shall have deducted what it deems its proper share, it will return it to its proper owner.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a constituency of 160,000 people. Fifty thousand of these by their daily toil make for themselves and the 110,000 who constitute their helpless and dependent families such subsistence as is left to a farming community, after paying the tax and tribute exacted by the revenue laws which we are trying to amend. I do not intend to claim that this subsistence is as comfortable as the rich soil and natural advantages of my State ought to afford. Nor do I intend to stop now to argue with the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], who was so recently Kentucky's guest, and who seems, like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], to think it the proper thing for a Republican protectionist who enjoys the hospitality of a Southern State, to seize the first opportunity to misrepresent and belittle his host.

Nor shall I, by comparing his speech in Louisville with his speech on this floor, rob him of the satisfaction it seems to afford him to boast that he not only insults, belittles, and misrepresents my people here, but that he was ill-mannered enough to do the same thing in the very home of his host. Kentucky is not what she ought to be. She is not what she longs to be. She is not what she would have been if my venerable friend from Pennsylvania had not so successfully spent twenty-five years of his mature and vigorous manhood in fastening on the country a system and rate of taxation that have made her industries pay a constant and exorbitant tribute to the industries of his State—that have made her people poor and his people rich.

The gentleman says he has—

> devoted the years of his vigorous manhood to the overthrow of the politica influence of the slave oligarchy in this country.

If he would only devote his declining years to the emancipation of its political affairs from the fatal embrace of its twin-sister, the high-tariff oligarchy, which fastens the chains of slavery on every human being who eats his bread in the honest sweat of his brow, without regard to race, color, or previous condition, he would outlive the day when even his imagination, distorted as it is by prejudice, could conjure up such a dark picture of Kentucky as to say of her that—

> the masses of her people are steeped in poverty and illiteracy, and are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life, but to the commonest and most absolute necessaries of Northern laborers.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the condition of the farming and laboring people of my State, engaged in occupations that pay but receive no protection, occupations that yield but meager returns on the money and labor expended after Pennsylvania has collected her tariff tolls, appeared pitiable in the extreme to the great apostle and representative of the tariff barons of the State of Pennsylvania.

But, Mr. Chairman, it ill becomes this great apostle and leader of that system of high tariff, which has wrought comparative poverty not only among my people but among all the people of the South and West, to taunt the victims his system has wronged.

Compared with his people, who have an equal or even a much less capital invested in manufacturing under the peculiar privileges and bounties the present tariff affords, I am forced to confess that my people are poor. And they will remain poor just so long as other industries have a legal right to levy 47 cents on every dollar that they are compelled to spend for the necessaries and comforts of life. No member on this floor has so far had the hardihood to claim that any farmer engaged in producing the great staples of this country gets directly one dollar of benefit from protection. It is admitted that he is constantly paying out more money on every one of the four thousand articles covered by the tariff schedule which he buys than he would pay if the tariff was reduced.

As a portion, and a very large portion, of the consumers, these farmers paid into the public Treasury last year their portion of $217,000,000 collected on imported goods. It will be admitted that four times as many home-produced goods were bought and consumed as there were of foreign. The tariff put it within the power of home manufacturers and producers to sell these goods for $868,000,000 more than they could have been bought for in the foreign markets if we were allowed to buy our goods where we can buy them the cheapest.

In every case where any foreign goods of a similar class were imported and sold here in competition with similar goods made at home the proof is conclusive that the home manufacturer was adding to his goods the entire tariff the foreigner was required to pay. Whenever and wherever the home manufacturer is selling at a less price than the foreign goods, with freight and tariff added costs, then it is shown conclusively that more tariff is being charged than is necessary to protect the home manufacturer, and he can make no complaint at a fair reduction.

If it be true, as gentlemen on the other side of the aisle in their stress are sometimes led to argue, that goods are made and sold as cheap or cheaper here than we could buy them if there was no tariff duty on them; or, in other words, that the tariff duty is not added to the price and paid by the consumer of home-produced goods, then the tariff is of no benefit to the manufacturer, and all this desperate resistance to tariff reduction by the representatives of protected interests is waste of lung power and valuable time. If it was not added; if it did not go into the pockets of the manufacturers; if the consuming farmers and laborers did not have it to pay, that side of the House would not only lead the van for reduction, but for its entire removal.

Turning again to agricultural Kentucky, which the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania says is "steeped in poverty and illiteracy," and which, I am bound to admit, is poor when compared with tariff-fatted Pennsylvania, let us see if the gentleman, had he been disposed to deal fairly with this matter, could not have found a better reason for this condition than that she is "the most illustrious victim of" the internal-revenue or the whisky trust. It would have occurred to one who could lift himself above sectional prejudices and mercenary interests, especially when he was searching for statistics to misrepresent our illiteracy, to examine the internal-revenue returns and to ask himself why it is that Ohio and New York, each of which pays more internal revenue than Kentucky, are not "steeped in poverty and illiteracy." Why it is that Illinois, which pays twice as much internal revenue and makes more and meaner whisky than any State in the Union, "is not steeped in poverty and illiteracy." [Applause.] Indeed, he might have come closer to home, even into the precincts of his own wealthy State of Pennsylvania, and found that she was paying two-thirds as much internal revenue as Kentucky, and that she had 19,540 retail whisky shops, more than five times as many as Kentucky, dealing out, as he eloquently expresses it, this—

most fruitful source of poverty, ignorance, vice, crime, disease, insanity, and ignominious death known to the civilization of the nineteenth century.

By looking a little further into the statistics he would have found that there were in the State of Illinois 11,635 and in the State of Ohio 15,540 retail liquor-dealers, the former over three times as many and the latter over four times as many as the 3,598 in the State of Kentucky. Yet the gentleman will not dare rise and say that Illinois, with over three times as many retail whisky-shops and making more mean whisky than Kentucky makes of good, is a victim of the whisky "trust" or is steeped in "ignorance and illiteracy." [Applause.] If he said that of Illinois my usually good-natured friend [Mr. CANNON] of that State, who so cordially indorsed this sentiment when uttered about Kentucky, would draw his Spofford's Almanac and utterly confound him by reading to him and the House all the statistical tables it contained.

But, Mr. Chairman, the explanation of Kentucky's poverty and Pennsylvania's wealth is so plain that he who runs may read. A few words tell the simple story: Kentucky pays 47 cents of tribute on every dollar's worth of tariff-protected goods she buys. Pennsylvania receives 47 cents tribute on every dollar of these goods she sells.

Commerce is nothing but exchange of products through the convenient representative of values known as money. And when the Kentucky farmer comes to exchange, through the process of sale and purchase, his farm products for the manufactured products of Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and the New England States, he is, under the existing tariff laws, required to give $1.47 of the value of his products, fixed in the markets of world, for $1 in value of those manufactured products fixed in the same market.

Thus for twenty-seven years the hard earnings of the farmers of the South and West have, under this high protective law, poured in a constant stream of 47 cents on every dollar into the coffers of the manufacturing States, with the same unerring certainty with which the waters from the mountains, the hillsides, and the valleys have under the laws of gravitation poured into the bosom of the ocean.

In my State, Mr. Chairman, there were in 1880, as shown by the census, 320,000 persons engaged in farming. The same census shows that for each person who labors there are two helpless women and children dependent on his labor for support.

The census does not show how much of the products of the farm are sold or exchanged for the necessaries of life which are manufactured or produced by our protected friends who say they will be ruined if this bill passes, but I assume that even the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who says the masses of our people "are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life, but to the commonest and most absolute daily necessaries of Northern laborers," will admit that every person engaged in farming spends on an average at least $100 for machinery, farming implements, clothing, sugar, and salt, and other protected articles for himself and the two that are dependent on him.

This is only $33⅓ for each per year, and is certainly poverty enough to satisfy even the distorted imagination of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Kentucky's 320,000 farmers spending $100 each with our manufacturing friends under a tariff averaging 47 per cent. will pay $22,000,000 for the goods they buy and $10,000,000 tariff for the glorious privilege of dealing with our own people.

Ten millions a year is the contribution, not of all these people of my State, "steeped in poverty and illiteracy" to this high-tariff Moloch, but the contribution of the farmers alone. My district contains one-tenth of the farmers of the State. One million dollars is exacted from its farmers, one hundred thousand from each of my ten counties, $100 from each man, woman, and child that from choice or stern necessity wields the hoe, follows the plow, or drives the reaper, whose occupation coming closer than any other to nature and nature's God ought to be as free from unjust human exactions as the air he breathes, which according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is about the only comfort the poverty-steeped illiterate enjoys.

But some one on the other side of the aisle in his zeal to justify this wrong is ready to say: "I am ready to admit that $33⅓ is less than will buy the tariff-taxed articles consumed even by the pauper in the Kentucky poor-house. But when you say that 47 per cent. is added to all those articles he uses you put the figures too high. The prices of all protected articles are not increased by the amount of the protection given." Then if they are not, why all this fuss about the small reduction asked in this bill? If you are not using the full rate of protection you are getting under the law, how are you to be hurt by striking off what you are not charging?

If you say that under the tariff laws you sell an article cheaper than it could be sold without a tariff, then I say abolish a tariff that does the manufacturer no good. Whenever a tariff does the consumer no harm it can do the manufacturer no possible good, and ought to be promptly abolished. But, if you think my per cent. is too high, name one yourselves. What is the per cent. of protection that we pay and you receive? It must be large or you would not stake your party and close your eyes to all considerations of common justice and honesty, to make the fearful fight that you are making here to retain it.

I will take the lowest per cent. that any honest Republican statistician will say the consumer pays the producer of tariff-taxed articles, and show that in ten years it will impoverish any community of consumers and enrich any community of producers of these articles. Reverse the effect of the tariff laws in Kentucky and Pennsylvania. Let us receive and her pay the same tribute that we are paying and she is receiving now. At the end of ten years Kentucky will bloom like the garden of Eden, and the venturesome crow that should attempt to wing his flight across the once rich and proud and arrogant Republican State of Pennsylvania would either carry his provisions with him or reach civilization again with an emptier stomach than ever went to bed with a Kentuckian "steeped in poverty and illiteracy." [Applause.]

But we are told, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer and laborer ought to pay the present rate of taxation cheerfully because the manufacturer needs it and uses it to pay the farmer better prices for his produce, and the laborer better wages for his service. These propositions seem now to constitute the larger part of the stock arguments for high protection, since the protected industries have been driven from the plea of infancy. To ask if the manufacturers and capitalists have heretofore dealt so generously with the farmer and laborer in return for the enormous sums these beneficent trustees have collected, ought to be a sufficient answer to both of these arguments.

But in view of the readiness with which the representatives of capital and monopoly on the other side of the House, driven from all other grounds of defense, retreat behind these subterfuges and make a piteous appeal for high protection in the interest of the poor laborer and farmer, it becomes us to examine these arguments with more seriousness than they really deserve. Necessity is the mother of invention, and the necessity of the attorneys of tariff-fed capital, in this last ditch, appealing in the interest of the two classes they have fleeced and impoverished since 1861, that their tribute be not disturbed, would merely excite ridicule, if it did not so often deceive.

Do they need the present rate of protection to enable them to pay, not only the wages now paid laborers, but even higher wages than ill-paid and discontented labor has ever demanded? What are they paying labor? Production is the joint earnings of capital and labor, and ought to be divided in proportion to what each puts into the common partnership. If a laborer borrows $1,000 of capital he pays for its use and the risk of its loss 6 per cent., or $60 per year. When the laborer is able thus to form a partnership with $1,000 of capital, by borrowing it and investing it himself, $60 is the amount of the joint profits that $1,000 of capital receives.

If the laborer invests this $1,000 in farming it is the universal experience, and no man who has observed the farming operations or studied the farming statistics of this country will deny the proposition, that as a rule even this interest, this apparently small exaction of capital, will finally consume all the profits of the joint venture. And in three cases out of four the farmer borrowing the capital will finally fail. On the other hand, the capitalist who lends his money at this rate, whether the borrower uses it in farming or other pursuits, will grow gradually but certainly rich. And I undertake to say now, and fear no contradiction, that no man or class of men have any right to invoke the aid of special laws to enable them to realize more than 6 per cent. on capital invested in the production of articles our own people must buy and consume.

And I undertake to say further, that whenever capital employs labor in producing that which the people must buy and consume, it has no right to demand, and especially has no right to invoke, the aid of law to demand more than 6 per cent., which is a fair profit on the capital invested. All the profits beyond that ought either be paid to the laborer by increase of wages or released to the consumer by reduction of prices. Applying these propositions to the manufacturing, farming, and labor statistics of the census of 1880, and what do we have?

The States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois seem to make the most desperate efforts through their high-tariff representatives to keep up tariff taxation, and thereby take care of the farmers and laborers not only of their own States but of the whole country. It is therefore pertinent to inquire what they are doing for the farmers and

laborers for whom they entertain such tender regard. I will not compare the rich manufacturer of these States with the poor farmer and laborer of Kentucky or of the Southern or Western farming States. Nor will I compare the farmer of Massachusetts with the farmer of Illinois, as is done by the St. Louis Republican, against which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] so warmly protested when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] a few days ago had such a comparison read at the Clerk's desk as part of his remarks.

But I will compare the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Massachusetts with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Massachusetts; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Pennsylvania with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Pennsylvania; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Ohio with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Ohio; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Illinois with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Illinois. These States are certainly conspicuous examples of the development of the farming and manufacturing industries in the same State, side by side, under the benign influence of the very tariff laws we are trying to reform.

The census shows that in 1880 there was in Massachusetts invested in farming $164,288,956; that there was engaged in farming 64,973 persons; that the value of the total products of the farms of that State for that year was $24,160,881. By simple division we find that to each person engaged in farming there was invested $2,528 of farm capital, made up of the value of the land, farming implements, and stock. We find further that the entire value of the product of the labor of one person using $2,528 of farm capital was $372 for the year. We find further that the entire capital invested in manufacturing in that State was $303,806,185; that the number of persons engaged was 352,255; that the entire product, after deducting the cost of material, was $244,-162,629.

It is easy to figure from this that to each person engaged in manufacturing there was invested $863, and the product of each person so employed using $863 capital was $693. A manufacturer, then, joining his labor to an investment of $863 made $693 in Massachusetts, and a farmer in the same State, joining his labor to $2,528, made $372; or the farmer, with nearly three times as much money invested in land, farm implements, and stock as the manufacturer invests in mills and machinery can make a little over one-half as much profit. This is the beneficent effect of our high protective tariff on the farmer in Massachusetts.

But some Massachusetts Republican is ready to jump up and say that, although more than twice as much money to the hand is made with one-third the capital in manufacturing as in farming, manufacturing capital pays the difference to the manufacturing laborer. Let us see whether this is so. Fortunately, the census statistics settle this, too. Those statistics show that the entire wages paid to the 352,255 persons engaged in manufacturing in Massachusetts was $128,315,362, or $364 to each person. I have found no statistics showing farm wages in that State.

But let us illustrate these statistics. Mr. A has $2,528 and he invests it in a farm, farming implements, and stock, and putting his own hands to the plow-handles works twelve months on this farm. Mr. B has only $863, which he invests in a manufacturing establishment, and hiring Mr. C, who has no money, to do his work, spends the year loafing around the hotel and market place telling the farmers and laborers the great value to them of the protective tariff, and writing me and other Congressmen that not only his special industry, but the entire country will go to the bow-wows if the rate of tariff is reduced.

Here we have the farmer, the manufacturer, and the laborer playing their respective parts in glorious manufacturing Massachusetts under the glorious tariff law which is kept up for the benefit of the farmer and laborer. How do they come out at the end of the year according to the census statistics. A has for the use of his $2,528 and his year's work $372. B receives as the product of his $863 and C's labor, $693. How much of this $693 does he give to C, the laborer, for his year's work? He gives him $364 and keeps $329. Two thousand five hundred and twenty-eight dollars and farmer A's hard year's work bring $372. Laborer C's year's work brings him $364. Eight hundred and sixty-three dollars and the war tariff brings manufacturer B, who has not struck a lick of work, $329.

But turn to Pennsylvania. Capital invested in farming in 1880, $1,095,405,324; number occupied in farming, 301,112; farm products, $129,760,476. To each person engaged in farming $3,637 is invested in land, implements, and stock. And the labor of each person so employed with $3,637 invested yields $431.

In manufacturing there is $474,510,993 invested, 387,072 hands engaged, who received in the year 1880 $134,055,904 in wages, and produced, after deducting raw material, $279,797,882.

To each person engaged this gives $1,252 of manufacturing capital invested, and each person produced $719 and gets $346 in wages. Substantially the same result follows. The farmer for a year's toil and $3,637 invested gets $431. The laborer engaged in manufacturing gets $346, and the tariff-eater, otherwise known as the manufacturing capitalist, can put in $1,252, do nothing, and get $373—$27 more than the laborer gets for his hard year's work, and only $58 less than the farmer gets for his year's work and his investment of nearly three times the money.

But some representative of the Ohio or Illinois protectionist, on the other side of the Hall, is ready to say that the lands in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania are poor; that no such meager returns to the farmer and laborer, as compared with the returns of manufacturing capital, can be found on the rich soil of Ohio or Illinois. Not too fast, my friends. Let us examine this tale-telling census. From the State of Ohio hails the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MCKINLEY] who writes such an elegant minority report to show that the country will be ruined if even the slightest move is made toward stopping manufacturing capital from robbing the farmer and the laborer.

In Ohio there was in 1880 invested in farming, $1,261,726,263. Of her population 397,495 were laboring in this occupation and the product was $156,777,152. In manufacturing there was invested in that State $188,939,614, and laborers engaged, 183,609, and they received $62,103,800 in wages and produced after deducting material, $132,964,-132. This shows that to each person engaged in farming there was invested $3,174; to each person engaged in manufacturing, only $1,029. That each person engaged in farming received for his year's labor and a farm capital of $3,174, products to the amount of $394. That each person engaged in manufacturing received for his year's labor, if he worked himself, and the use of only $1,029 of capital, $724 in products. That the manufacturing laborer received for wages only $338.

So that if the manufacturer invested his $1,029 in mills and machinery and hired a laborer to do his work, and gave himself up to idleness and the enjoyment of fine whisky and the other luxuries which our Republican friends are so anxious to untax, he gets $386—$42 more than the laborer, for whose benefit he has made so many hard fights to maintain the tariff, gets for twelve month's toil; and only $8 less than the farmer, to whom his tariff furnishes such a profitable market, gets for his twelve months' toil and his investment of $3,174.

And this in the great State of Ohio, where Democratic Representatives are expected to vote for high tariff because wool is protected. I can not so much blame her few sheep-farmers for clingling to protection on wool. Impoverished by manufacturing tariff, made beasts of burden for every bounty and subsidy manufacturing capitalists choose to heap upon them, it is but natural that the few who can, by the aid of these manufacturers, saddle part of their burdens on their fellow-farmers by collecting of them tribute on their wool, should hasten to do so. It is only another illustration of the stronger shifting burdens and levying tribute on the weaker.

But let us go farther West, to the great agricultural and manufacturing State of Illinois. If there is anywhere on the continent where it might be supposed that the farmer would hold his own with the manufacturer, tariff or no tariff, it would be on the rich lands of Illinois. In 1880 Illinois had $1,175,772,293 invested in farming, and 436,371 of her population were engaged in the business. Her entire farm products were $203,980,137; or each person engaged in farming invested $2,694 in capital, and with this capital and his labor produced $468. In the same State for the same year there was invested in manufacturing $140,652,066, and 144,727 persons employed. The product, after deducting cost of material, was $125,020,766, and the wages paid amounted to $57,429,085; or each person employed used $972 of capital, produced $864 in value of manufactured articles, after deducting price of material, and received in wages $397, the same results as in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

The Illinois protectionist invests $972 in some manufacturing corporation, hires one of the laborers he loves so much to do the work-spends the year in reading the New York Tribune and delivering lectures on the benefits of a high protective tariff to laborers, and his hard-working, horny-fisted neighboring farmer, who has $2,694 invested in his farm and is working twelve hours a day to try "to make buckle and tongue meet" at the end of the year.

And what is the result? How do the three come out? The farmer gets for his hard year's labor and the use of $2,694 invested, $468. The laborer who furnished the year's hard labor to the capitalist, gets $397, and the poor manufacturer who is going to close out his business and be forever ruined, and is not going to make any more cheap goods for the farmers and laborers of this country, and is not going to furnish the farmer a good market for his produce any longer, nor the laborer high wages for his work, if the Mills bill passes, gets $467 for the use of $972 and the hard labor he performs in talking up high tariff and filling the mails with petitions and circulars sents to Congress to assure members that his industry is about to be ruined.

Glorious country this where for a year's toil on a farm costing, with implements and stock, $2,694, the farmer can make only one dollar more than he who "neither toils nor spins" gets on $972 invested in a manufacturing corporation. Where the manufacturer yokes a laborer to $972 of capital, and when this unfair and unequal partnership at the end of the year has made $864, keeps $467 for the part of this small capital, and gives the laborer only $397 for his share. In common decency I would have at least divided equally.

But, Mr. Chairman, whenever a member comes on this floor and lifts his voice in defense of an industrial system that, in its practical results,

treats an intelligent American laborer as worth less in our political economy than $972 of capital and pays such a laborer less than that sum earns, and at the same time raises his hands and rolls his eyes back into the past in holy horror at negro slavery, which never rated human service so low, I involuntarily exclaim "Thou hypocrite." The Pharisee "thanking God that he was not as other men" was a model of humility compared with such an exhibition of offensive self-complacency.

But, Mr. Chairman, when from the same census we compare the condition of the unprotected farmer and laborer with the condition of the protected manufacturer in the entire country, the startling results are still more damning to this iniquitous relic of war legislation.

The 7,670,493 persons engaged in farming in the United States in 1880 had invested $12,104,081,440, or an average of $1,578 to each person. They produced $2,213,402,564 in farm products, only $289 to each person using a farm capital of $1,578. The 2,732,595 laborers engaged in manufacturing used an investment in manufacturing capital of $2,790,272,606, or only $1,021 to each person employed. They produced, after deducting cost of material, $1,972,773,642, or $772 to each person employed.

These 2,732,595 manufacturing laborers received in wages $947,953,795, or only $347 to each person. The manufacturing laborer, for whose wages the manufacturing capitalist has such tender regard, gets only $347 out of $772 earned, while this modern philanthropist pockets $375 for the use of $1,021 capital for one year. For this capital, which ought not to bring him over 6 per cent., he gets 36 per cent. without adding a stroke of his labor. The farmer can get only 18 per cent. on his capital, throwing in his own work for the entire year.

No wonder the protected manufacturer, who invests his capital in manufacturing and yokes one of the laborers, for whom he similates such intense affection, to each $1,021 of his investment and gives the laborer only $347 and keeps $375 of the $772 earned, winces and squirms when the Mills bill proposes to reduce the 36 per cent. he is receiving by reducing the tariff which alone makes such enormous gains possible.

No wonder the wages of farm laborers are low, when the tariff robs the farmer not only of the means with which to pay labor, but of the means to furnish himself and family with the commonest comforts of life. No wonder manufacturing labor is struggling for its rights, when manufacturing capital is demanding and receiving for $1,021 more annual divdends by $28 than it pays the laborer for a year's wages.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in the face of these figures, furnishing, as they do, the solution to the agricultural prostration as compared with the manufacturing thrift and wealth, of even these most favored States in this Union; in the face of constant strikes and lockouts which mark the fierce struggle of laborers in these States to wrest from capital sufficient of these enormous profits to afford a comfortable subsistence, the representatives of tax-pampered manufacturing capitalists but serve their masters in making their appeals in the name of the farmer and laborer.

Listening to the discussion on this floor one would think it had been conclusively proven that the reduction of the tariff meant reduction of American wages. So far from this being true, it is admitted by its strongest advocates that up to this time all efforts of protectionists to demonstrate this proposition have failed. In the annual report of Mr. Herbert Radclyffe, the secretary of the Home Market Club, of Boston, on the last of April, which each one of you has received among the wagon-loads of high-tariff literature poured in upon you, he, lauding constant agitation of that club in the interest of protection, says:

> I believe that the agitation will yet demonstrate that a reduction of the tariff means a reduction in wages to the American wage-earners.

If after all these years of bold assertion of this proposition, and superhuman effort to establish it, the demonstration is only a thing to be hoped for in the future, had we better not heed the lessons taught by the census statistics and labor strikes and lockouts, and turn our attention to bettering the laborer's condition by reducing the cost of his living?

Mr. Chairman, you can no more reduce the wages of labor engaged in manufacturing in this country by the reduction of the tariff than you can reduce the price of the farmer's wheat, corn, and cotton. Both are fixed in the markets of the world. Every honest student of the labor problem will admit that while the laborer of this country receives more per day, week, month, or year than similar labor is paid in Europe, yet he receives no more, and, indeed, in many cases less, for a fixed amount of work here than is paid for the same amount of work in Europe.

This is because he accomplishes so much more work in the same time on account of his superior intelligence and the superior character of our machinery and methods of production. This has been so fully shown by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and by other gentlemen in this debate, and is so fully admitted by protectionists who meet this question fairly, that I shall not stop to discuss it.

Then where will the loss, if any, resulting from the tariff reduction fall? The struggles of capital, organized and unorganized, in this House and out of it, to prevent this reduction answers this question. If there is loss to any one, which I very much doubt, it will be in reduced dividends on capital. And reduced dividends on capital means reduced interest to the borrower. It means one long step towards the emancipation of our debt-ridden cities, counties, townships, and farms from onerous interest charges, that year by year destroy the prosperity and consume the earnings of the people who furnish the labor, the enterprise, and the energy that organize States, build cities, and develop the waste places of this great country. I believe that a proper reduction of the tariff will cheapen capital, break down unlawful trusts, and emancipate the farmer and laborer from the unjust and unnecessary exactions of the manufacturer and capitalist.

I am not surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] should talk differently, even though he knew my views were correct. Like Demetrius of Ephesus, he and his co-workers of like occupation, who by means of protection have fastened themselves like parasites onto the backs and stomachs of the poor who must eat and wear their goods, have made no small gain thereby. Indeed, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MCKINNEY] so thoroughly photographed that gentleman and the tariff monopolists whom he represents that I can not refrain from quoting a paragraph from his speech delivered in this debate.

> Mr. Chairman, I have read in one of the old histories, written many centuries ago, of a class of people who had a monopoly of a certain industry and made great gain therefrom. And there was a certain man came into the land where these people dwelt and preached against them, and his words were so powerful that those who used curious arts brought their books and burned them before all men, and they counted the price of them and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. And we are told at—
>
> "The same time there was no small stir about that way, for a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain to the craftsmen, whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation and said, 'Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth; moreover, ye see and hear that not alone at Ephesus but almost throughout all Asia this Paul has persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands; so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipeth.' And when they heard these things they were full of wrath and cried out, saying, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.'"
>
> Now, like these people of old, Pennsylvania has for a long time had a monopoly in many of these industries which have brought to them great wealth. An apostle has come into their midst who dwells at the other end of this avenue, and has proclaimed to the people against such a monopoly, and many who have heretofore believed in their doctrine are repenting of their sins and proclaiming their conversion before all the people. [Applause.]
>
> And now comes the great apostle of protection and calls together his people and says: Sirs, ye know that by this protection we have our wealth. Moreover, ye see and hear that not only in Pennsylvania, but almost throughout all the nation this apostle of reform hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that there be no justice in this doctrine of protection, so that not only this our wealth is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the great goddess of protection should be despised, whom Pennsylvania and all the land hath heretofore worshiped. And when they heard these words they were full of wrath, and cried out, Great is the goddess of protection! [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I intend that justice shall be done Demetrius in this comparison. To his credit be it said that history nowhere records that Demetrius ever, either as a guest or otherwise, belittled or misrepresented the people whom he had impoverished in accumulating his ill-gotten gains.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle say that protection stimulates the manufacturing industries. I admit that it does. It has stimulated them as strong drink stimulates the human system. Leaning and relying on this stimulant year by year, they have demanded and received more of it, till now, drunk and debauched by long and excessive indulgence, they make piteous appeals for more copious draughts from the bowl of protection.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a contest between the principles of free trade and protection, no matter how much the blatant demagogue may expect to deceive the people by this cry. It is an attempt to relieve the people from a small portion of unjust and unnecessary taxation. But I wish to close with a word of caution to those arrogant protectionists in and out of this House who denounce every man who desires tariff reform as a free-trader.

Refuse to reduce and reform the tariff; refuse to lift any part of this burden from the shoulders of the toiling millions of this country; defeat this bill as you have defeated all other measures of relief, and a long-suffering people will rise in the majesty and strength of desperation, and sweep from the statute-books a system the abuse of which has wrought such widespread injustice and poverty in a land where honest labor, under just laws, would bring peace and plenty to every home. [Applause.]

[Mr. SHIVELY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. McCLAMMY. Mr. Chairman, the questions of revenue, of how to get the necessary funds to bear the expenses of the Government, has at all times been exceedingly interesting. The object of all government is to secure the best interests of the governed. For this have men banded together into societies, organized governments, made constitutions, and framed laws; the object being to promote the general welfare and secure a community in which individual prosperity and happiness would be the basis of governmental strength and durability. And so our forefathers, fleeing from the wrongs and oppressions of the Old World, came to this new continent and settled into communities and colonies, which in due time were formed into counties and States, and one grand Government, the United States of America. And so the Government was formed and framed for the protection and benefit of each individual, as well as for the protection and benefit of the whole.

And thus our fathers started on a grand and mighty career, after a terrible and exhausting struggle of seven long and weary years for independence. It was never their purpose to flee from one oppression to be sufferers and slaves of another. The bloody struggle had united the people in one patrotic brotherhood, and the white-winged messengers of peace found no sectional lines stretching from east to west to divide and mar and checker this glorious country, the fortitude and courage of whose sons had plucked liberty from the hands of the despot, and forced the Kingdom of Great Britain to proclaim the colonies "Free and independent States." And then "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," did our fathers "ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America;" "to promote the general welfare," and not create and protect monopolies and trust combinations to enrich the few and enslave and impoverish the many; to protect all, and not enforce a condition in which a few would become the wealthy class and the multitude the poor class. This was not intended to be a government where the word "caste" should line and have a place, but a free government, where the poorest may become rich, and the highest and most distinguished place and office the legitimate ambitions of the sons of toil who follow the plow or drive the jack-plane or wield the trowel. And if the true spirit of the Government is ever destroyed, if liberty is finally lost, it will be because the people will have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage.

I will read with great pleasure the able message of the President of the United States addressed to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of this session, and sir, I felt a growing interest in my heart and recognized the fact that the country had once more a Chief Executive who felt an interest in the whole country, who recognized himself to be President of the whole country, uninfluenced by sectional ill-will, animated by a patriotic desire to promote the best interests of all the people, and who early calls the attention of Congress and the whole country, not to how best the country may be kept in continued discord, nor how best the strifes and hatreds of sectional animosities may be inflamed and kept burning, but how best peace, prosperity, and happiness may be secured and perpetuated to the people of a glorious and harmonious government after the clouds of civil war have rolled away and the sunshine of peace and kindness once more united friend with friend and section with section. Those dark and bloody and unhappy days are gone, and I hope forever. And as the signs and symbols of the hard strife are fading away from our memories we gladly unite in the hearty wish for the prosperity and continued welfare of the whole country. And for one I shall stand by and sustain that policy which may be best calculated to preserve the peace and secure and promote the happiness and prosperity of the people.

Questions of finance, of political economy and governmental administration confront us, and as lawmakers, representatives of the people, we must address ourselves to these grave and great questions. It may not be expected that partisan spirit has ceased to exist, but hope revives when we witness, as we often do at this Capitol and upon this floor, how Representatives on all sides, if not agreeing in all things, agreeing at least to move steadily on for what is believed to be best for the whole country.

As for myself, Mr. Chairman, I am here with no other purpose in view than to represent my constituents faithfully, and secure for them, so far as my own humble efforts can be effective, the passage of such laws as will enhance the welfare of my constituents, the welfare of my State, and the welfare of the whole country. I have given attention to such matters as I have thought would best secure these results, and if my voice has not been heard upon every question which has challenged the attention of the House, I have felt no less interest and given them no less labor and attention.

But, sir, after all, we have as yet accomplished but little for the relief of the people, and I have thought it were high time we were giving attention to the necessities of the hour. What has yet been done for the relief of the tax-burdened people? What has been done to carry out the recommendations of the President for a relief from the dangers and oppressions of an overflowing Treasury? What has been done to remove from the weary necks of the people the now unnecessary and oppressive war taxes, which to this day, nearly twenty-five years after the close of the war, hang in gloom over the people like a miserable nightmare, attacking labor, destroying the fruits of industry, expanding further the already overflowing and swollen pockets of the rich, and breaking down the hopes of the laboring classes as the rich grow richer and the poor become poorer? Sir, visions of horror rise up before me as I look in the face of the uncertain future, and for one I am here to work and to vote for each and every measure which will restore to the people prosperity at home. And I am ready now to vote for the removal of these high and unreasonable and oppressive taxes, and assist as best I may all efforts, come they from whatever quarter they may, to a return to the times when capital and labor shall be restored to their true relation of twin sisters in this common inheritance of the great Union of our fathers. We acknowledge no authority or claim from any quarter or section of superiority, and I say to Congress and to the Chief Executive, give all the people a fair and equal chance.

Mr. Chairman, time will not serve me to investigate and canvass in a speech at this time all the multifarious questions involved in the bill now before us. But, sir, I have examined the bill in detail, and I shall cheerfully support it. It is a moderate bill. It does not cut down at one lick all the inequalities of the present tariff law. It was thought wise to so legislate that business, now supported and maintained by the kindness and partialities and favoritism of the Government, as seen and felt under the existing law, should have time enough to be warned that the days of their infancy have about expired and they must prepare to walk alone.

Before I enter further the discussion of the injustice and unfairness of a tax upon the necessaries of life generally called the tariff, I wish to consider another species of tax, invented and brought into being by the Republican party, as is said by them, to meet the necessities of immediate war and procure the means of supporting the Government in war between the States, called the "war of the rebellion." To raise a sufficiency of funds to carry on that war it became necessary, in the opinion of those then in control of the Congress, to pass what was called the internal-revenue law. Under this act incomes, and banks, and matches, whisky and brandy, ale, beer, cigars, snuff, tobacco, etc., were taxed and a large amount of revenue was collected, which at that time was of great necessity to meet the exigencies of civil war. These were essentially war taxes, and should have been discontinued as soon as the necessity which created them had passed away.

They were willingly borne, when necessary, because the people recognized the necessities of the Government; but they were never popular, and as the Republican party held on to them after the war was over and used the thousands of internal-revenue officers, who like locusts filled all the land, as instruments in the hands of that party to terrorize the people, to spy upon them and entrap them in all kinds of charges of violations of the law and through and by such influence and prosecutions and persecutions control the elections and perpetuate the continuance of that party in power, the law itself soon become to be despised and hated by the people, and a universal desire was for the repeal of these odious laws. The war was over and the Republicans were in power in every branch of the Government. Did they repeal them? No! In the Forty-seventh Congress the Republicans were in full possession of the Government and controlled every branch of the Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—both Houses of Congress and the President. Mr. Chairman, then they had a fair chance to repeal the internal revenue. Did they do so? Did they introduce one bill to do so? They were in full power; did they take the tax off of brandy and whisky and other distilled spirits? No, sir, no! Did they then take the tax off or make one step to take it off of tabacco? No, sir, no!

What did the Republicans in that Congress do towards lightening the burden of the tax-payers then? Listen, ye oppressed tax-payers; the Republican party then in full power took the tax off of banks and bank capital and incomes, and never said a word about removing the tax on distilled spirits and tobacco. If the Republican party was the friend of the people who suffer from these onerous and disagreeable taxes, why did it not remove them in the Forty-seventh Congress when in full power? There can be but one answer, Mr. Chairman. The Republican party was not in sympathy with the people, not in sympathy with those who had to meet these hard taxes, and only passed such laws as would relieve the wealthy—the banks and those who had large incomes—and gave not a vote to relieve the oppressed or remove these hard laws from the necks of the poor.

But that party now is moving to lift these taxes. Ah! Mr. Chairman, they pretend to be so doing. Following the lead of one who sits on this side of this Chamber, they pretend to be marshaling their forces to repeal these laws, but, sir, judging them by the past, I assert that this is a pure species of political hypocrisy, a mere trick to deceive the people. I charge that at this day they are in favor of keeping up the taxes on spirits and tobacco, and would only vote to take them off in order to keep the tax up on breadstuffs, clothing, and the real necessities of life. I sir, myself, would vote to remove the odious tax and forever abolish it, but I must also vote to relieve the people from an onerous tax on the prime necessities of life, and while I am anxious to remove all these internal-revenue taxes, I must say that I prefer cheap clothes, cheap shoes, cheap hats, cheap blankets, cheap plows, cheap hoes, cheap axes, and cheap necessaries of life to cheap whisky.

A protective tariff is an unjust and unfair discrimination by the Government in favor of one class of citizens against another class of citizens. It is an enforced contribution in which one man is made to contribute to the support of another man's business without a resulting benefit, and contrary to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. The Government has a right to tax people either directly or indirectly to raise money to carry on the Government, but Congress has no right under the Constitution to force A to support B in his business. What right has the Government to show such difference and such partiality as to pass a law to force one man, without value received, to give his money to the assistance of another man in his private business? And yet that is what those who advocate a protective tariff are doing, and that is what has been forced upon the working masses and poor toilers for lo! these many years, until injustice and wrong come up in sighs and

groans from the oppressed poor in a greater grief and deeper woe than escaped from the hearts of the unhappy Jews when they toiled and endured Egyptian bondage.

That this Government of the people and for the people, foremost in the arts and sciences and in free laws, with a Constitution the admiration of the world, declaring equal rights to all and special privileges to none, the handy but immortal work of those immortal heroes who before they would submit to have forced upon them a stamp tariff tax of a few pence on tea, and for the maintenance of that right pledged and offered up their fortunes, their sacred honors, and their lives—I say that we, the descendants of such a people, should come at this day, under the cringing and whining plea of aiding and helping poor infant industries, thereby seeking to grow rich by placing hard burdens, grievous to be borne, upon the necks of the poor, the toilers, the workingmen and workingwomen, and the young and tender children, who, because of this powerful giant-infant, are sent so early to the tread-mills of the machine shops instead of to school, that the vast investments in manufactories of affluent corporations might be sustained and upheld in their already too great influence and power—these crimes, I say, are enough to shock, to startle the people from their lethargy to rise up in mass and drive these would be lords and masters from their already fortified castles.

I have not time, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee and the country, in detail, to the demands of those who are seeking power and influence from the General Government with which to oppress the people. I can only call attention to a few necessaries, the markets of which are under the control and influence of the protectionists. Such articles as sugar, salt, wool and woolen goods and wearing apparel, blankets, hats, shoes, etc.

Under the plea of aiding infant industries the tools of the workingman are sold at high prices to benefit the corporations which manufacture them.

Spades and shovels and hoes have to pay a tariff rate of about 35 per cent. in order that the same articles made here may be forced upon the men who are compelled to use them. So, also, scythes, sickles, and reaping-hooks are made by the present tariff 35 per cent. higher to the purchaser as the law now stands; screws of iron, called wood-screws, cross-cut saws taxed in 1883 8 cents per lineal foot, and mill pit and drag, over 9 inches wide, 15 cents per lineal foot, and hand-saws over 24 inches in length, $1 per dozen and 30 per cent. additional. Let all the workers in wood hear this. Axes, hatchets, and adzes, a tariff tax of 35 per cent., drawing-knives 24 per cent., squares in iron or steel 6 cents per pound and 30 per cent. additional, and iron squares marked on one side 3 cents per pound and 30 per cent. additional.

I call the attention of the committee and of the people to these high taxes put upon these necessary tools of the mechanics and laboring men. Before a man can start out on his work to support himself and family he must go to a store and purchase these tools of his trade, and pay into the hands of the manufacturers an extra price above what he might get them for, in order that the manufacturer may receive his protected blessings from a one-sided and partial administration of the Government. This, Mr. Chairman, is Republican rule—Republican methods of dealing with the workingman.

If we look to an earlier day, when it was said American manufactories were young and needed assistance, you will see that our earlier statesmen did not make the burdens of the people so hard to be borne.

Wool and woolen goods unmanufactured had no protection from 1789 to 1816, and not until March 3, 1857, did this industry seem to need protection, but was absolutely free up to that time, and then a tariff of 24 per cent. was levied. The act of June 6, 1872, reduced the duty 10 per cent., and the act of March 3, 1875, re-enacted the duties to what they were prior to the act of June 6, 1872, and, Mr. Chairman, as the law now is the people are unmercifully taxed to support these woolen manufactories. Blankets, flannel goods, all goods with wool as part of the texture with as high a tariff as possible, so as to amount to prohibition to the foreign manufacturer with the privilege to the home manufacturers to ask as high a price as these bloated corporations may agree to demand from the consumer. And so the poor consumer has to pay these pets of the Government from the shoes and socks which keep his feet from the ground to the shirts and pants and coats which cover his body, to the hat which shelters his head from the sun and storms. These infant industries are strong. They very nearly own us. They are seeking to be our masters, and we are nearly their slaves.

I call briefly attention to duties on iron, namely:

Cast-iron butts and hinges, 2½ cents per pound.
1883, hoop-iron, $20 per ton.
Iron in rods, $25 per ton, 1¼ cents per pound.
Slit-iron, $25 per ton, 1¼ cents per pound.
Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than 1 inch or more than 7 inches wide, nor less than one-quarter inch or more than 2 inches thick. Rounds from one-half inch to 4 inches in diameter, from 1883 1 cent per pound. Bar-iron ditto. Flats less than three-eighths inch. Rounds and squares less than three-quarter inch, 1¼ cents per pound.
Horseshoe nails in 1883, 4 cents per pound.
Cut nails and wrought nails from 1¼ to 4 cents per pound. Spikes, 2 cents per pound.
Pig-iron, 1864, $9 per ton.
Pig-iron, 1870, $7 per ton.
Tacks, brads, and sprigs, not including 16 ounces to 1,000, 2½ cents per thousand.
Iron cables and chains, 2½ cents per pound.

We are all, with every interest we have in life, completely dominated by the power and influence of the protectionists.

To show, Mr. Chairman, the enormous amount of tax the people pay, from all sources of taxation, the total amount of receipts of the Government from all directions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, was $371,403,277.66. To make this sum, this enormous drain from the earnings of the people, there was paid in on customs, or tariff, $217,286,893.13, and on the internal revenue $118,823,391.22, which makes an average duty or tax on goods imported into this country of 47 per cent. And of this immense tax we paid a tax on—

Sugar, molasses, and sugar candy	$58,016,686.00
Iron and steel, and manufactures of	20,713,234.00
Wool	5,729,717.00
Manufactures of wool	29,729,717.20
Silk	15,540,301.00
Glass and glassware	4,510,312.00
Earthenware	2,409,796.16
Hemp, jute, material for cotton bagging, and flax goods	6,228,310.41
Cotton and cotton goods	1,233,599.57
Lumber and salt, in round figures	1,700,000.00
Total	145,981,773.14

I might go on for hours and hours enumerating the articles which the protectionists have dominion over, and show how they do place heavy burdens on the people—such articles of prime necessity as sugar and salt and wool and woolen goods and wearing apparel and blankets and hats and shoes and almost every article used as necessaries for life which are produced and manufactured in this country.

Upon what principle of right, I ask, Mr. Chairman, has a man who raises sheep to have the Government use its power to enable him to receive for his wool more than it is worth in an open market? What has he done that he should be protected at the expense of the poor? Will the Government make laws to keep the poor from being clad? Will the Government so legislate that the poor whom, we are told by the great Master, we always have with us, must suffer for ordinary raiment to protect their flesh and skin from the cold rains and snows and blasts of winter winds that creep through the crevices of their poorly thatched homes? Will the Government take sides with the wool-growers in a controversy between them and the poor widow with her orphan children, as to how much they shall exact from her to clothe the little boys and girls, and assist these rich establishments in grinding out of the unhappy widow her last dollar to meet the hard necessities of her unhappy life? I again ask, will the Government take sides with these vast monopolies against the poor widow with her young and tender brood, amongst them, perhaps, boys who are to be the defenders of this country? Will the Government assist in making these boys and girls, the children of the poor, tributary slaves and vassals of these powerful trusts and corporations?

Mr. Chairman, I speak plainly. I use the simplest and plainest words which can express the hardship of the suffering poor, the oppressed and tax-burdened laborers and workingmen of our country; and if perchance I may contribute some good I shall be satisfied that my time at the capital of my country has not been spent in vain.

I want to see Congress engaged in making laws which shall be equal and just to all men. We want no partiality shown by the Government to a favored few. But let all men stand alike, upon their personal merits and worth, and not a few favored at the expense of the many laborers of the land. We can not disguise the fact that a miserable and wretched discontent is now universal with the patriotic workingmen of our country; and while I am opposed to strikes and other combinations of like character, because I believe needed redress of their unjust grievances can not be secured by such methods, yet I do sympathize with the efforts of labor to secure a just reward for toil and sweat, that moves engines, builds houses, tills lands, sows seed, reclaims waste places, and fills barns and smokehouses with corn and meat. And for one, in this great struggle for bread, for life, I say to the Government and to Congress, Hands off! and let the laboring man have a fair and equal chance with the capitalist, with the bondholder, the stock-broker, and the kings of imperial corporations and trusts.

If you would not sap the blood of patriotism which gives vigor and life to the Government; if you would not destroy the love of country now so fresh and pure in the hearts of the yeomanry of our country; if you would put down a mean effort to establish caste in this free country, which like some miserable wire-grass is now clogging the plowshare of labor, we will have no more class or sectional legislation; industry will be encouraged by laws which are equal in their burden and equal in their protection and benefits to all, the rich and the poor, the laboring men, the farmers, the mechanics, the merchants, and the manufacturers. Then real peace will be established and strikes and riots will no more disturb our repose.

The honest working people are tired of supporting and gazing at these lilies of the valley, who toil not, neither do they spin; and yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them.

This is a free Government, and the people want freedom in it—freedom to all, oppression to none; equality before and in the laws to all; special and preferred protection and privileges to none. [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BYNUM having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. LANE, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. SHIVELY (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 9997) to relieve Eliah Blake from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 9998) to amend the law relating to the execution of wills in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 9999) for the relief of Bellamy S. Hine—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10000) for the relief of John N. Graves—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 10001) for the relief of D. B. Warren—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10002) for the relief of A. B. Medlan—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10003) for the relief of Joel McKee—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10004) granting a pension to John W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 10005) granting a pension to Miss Mary Hayne, as a nurse in the war of 1861—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 10006) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Whitehouse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10007) for the relief of Henry Rose—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAISH: A bill (H. R. 10008) for the relief of the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAN: Joint resolution (H. Res. 170) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a permit to Frederick Freund to erect a hotel upon the lands of the United States at Fort Washington, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Petition of United States Glue Manufacturing Association, favoring the retention of the present duties on glue, gelatine, and isinglass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of Mrs. Theodoria Hoskins, widow of Maj. Jesse Hoskins, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of vessel-owners of Detroit, Mich., against winter bridge over Detroit River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of H. N. Whittle and others, of Mechanic Falls, Me., for reform in the method of employing convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of employés of the Pioneer Twine Mills of New Brighton, Pa., against reduction of duties on hemp and flax and kindred fibers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Local Assembly No. 4047, shoe cutters, and of Maggie Jordan and 8 others, of Brockton, Mass., for the bill to limit the sale of convict-made goods—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Petition of Local Assembly No. 2094, Knights of Labor, of Ohio, against civil pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Board of Transportation of Nebraska, relative to State control of certain railroads—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition of James B. Roberts, alias James Brown, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Papers and evidence in support of House bill No. 3157, granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Petition of Edward Whitehouse, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of J. H. W. Platts and others for reference of their claim 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. ATKINSON: Of citizens of Snyder County, and of pharmacists of Mount Union, Pa.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of druggists of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. MAISH: Of citizens of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. WISE: Of citizens of West Point, Va.

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. C. H. ALLEN: Of Charles H. Ames and others, and of C. W. Swallow and others, of Massachusetts.

By Mr. MORROW: Of citizens of Nevada County, California.

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. ATKINSON: Of farmers of Dundore, Pa.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of Stevensville, Pa.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Of O. D. Potter and others, of Webster, Me.

By Mr. HIESTAND: Of citizens of Hilltown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. PENINGTON: Of citizens of Bridgeville, Del.

By Mr. ROCKWELL: Of citizens of Cheshire, Mass.

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 200 citizens of Fennville, Mich.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Of 16 ex-soldiers of Eureka, Gallia County, Ohio.

The following petition, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, was referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of citizens of Franklin County, Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May* 17, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 5259) to relieve Jacob G. Bostatter from the charge of fraudulent enlistment; and

A bill (H. R. 7398) to subdivide the eastern judicial district of Louisiana, and to fix the time and place for holding terms of court therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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 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, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the report of the committee of conference on the Cincinnati exposition bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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 and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4, to October 27, 1888, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That there shall be appointed a committee of Congress composed of ten members, five to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Said committee is authorized and directed to visit said exposition and make such report to Congress in that behalf as they may deem needful and proper."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$147,750;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate