

By Mr. GAY: Petition of citizens of Jeanerette, La., in favor of House bill 8716 to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAUGEN (by request): Petition of citizens of Pepin County, Wisconsin, for a pension for George W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of E. J. Stonebraker and 33 others, citizens of Hampton, Iowa, in favor of House bill 8716—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of A. P. Lewis and 30 others, citizens of the Twenty-fourth district of Pennsylvania, against the reduction of the tariff on window-glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of Iowa railway postal clerks, for the passage of the bill to readjust their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LANDES: Petition of Henry C. Wilsong, late of Company K, Fifty-third Indiana Volunteers, for a pension, indorsed by M. W. Nanly and 100 others, citizens of Wayne County, Illinois—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of A. V. Fisher and 53 others, of Methuen; of Ira D. Rodgers and 28 others, of Lynn; of E. G. Knowles and 55 others, of Lowell; of D. L. Richards and 53 others, of North Dana; of C. E. Mann and 69 others, of Lexington; of M. A. Stone and 69 others, of Reading; and of H. M. Chadwick and 69 others, of Lawrence, Mass.; of Edward A. Talpey and 29 others, of Cape Neddick; and of Edwin Towne and 77 others, of Waterville, Me.; of J. M. Chaffee and 69 others, of Staffordville, Conn.; and of C. W. Preston and 63 others, of Boston, Vt., in favor of bill introduced by Mr. LODGE for repeal of duties on sugar and molasses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYMAN: Petition of railway postal clerks of Iowa, in favor of the passage of the bill to readjust their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Knights of Labor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McADOO: Petition of Knights of Labor, and of the Pioneer Labor Association, of Jersey City, N. J., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McCOMAS: Petition of Joseph C. Keller, of Frederick County, Maryland, for payment of his war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of T. H. Conon, administrator of Alfred O. Conon, of Marshall County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., for the establishment of a national quarantine station at San Francisco—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of the same, for an immediate appropriation of \$850,000 for a post-office site at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the same, recommending an appropriation for the survey of public lands in California—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of Local Assembly No. 3606, Knights of Labor, of Raleigh, N. C., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PEEL: Memorial of Loyal Creek Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Mrs. M. A. Bauman and Louisa Tensel, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the Minnesota Academy of Medicine, urging that instruments, scientific apparatus, medical books and materials, etc., be placed on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of Local Assembly 1466, Knights of Labor, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of House bill No. 8716 to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHIVELY: Petition of members of the Grand Army of the Republic, Women's Relief Corps, and Sons of Veterans, of Silver Lake, Ind., for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Petition of the Cotton Exchange of Houston, Tex., in relation to the sale of options on cotton and other products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of John H. Harris, for payment of his war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Mary E. Walter, of Williamson County, Tennessee, for reference of her 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. KELLEY: Of 111 citizens of Philadelphia,

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Of G. V. Collins, of Charlott Mich.

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. BINGHAM: Of members of the West Philadelphia Rifle and Gun Club, of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. COLLINS: Of professors, teachers, and advanced students in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, of Harvard College.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of Edward Donohoe and others, citizens of Greensburgh, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GOFF: Of A. McCoy and others, of West Virginia.

By Mr. GROUT: Of W. S. Williams and 24 others, citizens of East Roxbury, Vt.

By Mr. PHELPS: Of citizens of New Jersey.

The following petition, 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, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of John Chalfant and other ex-soldiers of Fayette and Washington Counties, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Of 52 citizens of Fayette and Clinton Counties, Ohio.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: Of 121 citizens of Winona, Dodge, and Wabasha Counties, Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 18, 1888.

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

The House was called to order by Mr. McMILLIN, who stated that the Speaker was unavoidably absent, and directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON McMILLIN to preside at the session of the House to-day.

JNO. G. CARLISLE, Speaker.

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read in part.

On motion of Mr. MCKINLEY, the reading of the remainder of the Journal was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOOKER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

On motion of Mr. MILLS the reference of bills and communications upon the Speaker's table was postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order, and I move that the morning hour for the call of committees for reports be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present from committees may send them to the Clerk's desk and have them duly referred.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FILING OF REPORT.

The following report was filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

RELIEF OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. BROWER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of certain soldiers and sailors of the late war; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

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

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 in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the highest duty of the statesman in this country, where we proceed upon the theory of the equality of man, is to assist as best he may in maintaining the equality of the nation's forces. It is for the reason that within the last few years, and following close upon the heels of a mighty martial struggle wherein the further perfection of our fundamental idea of government was the leading thought, we have drifted unwittingly, at least on the part of the masses, into a species of class legislation that is discriminating between the industries of men, thus nullifying the fruits of the victories we have gained in the direction of legally equalizing men, and subverting the underlying principles of our Government, that I have been an attentive and interested listener to the debate that has been in progress upon the measure pending before the House.

The discussion has already taken a wide range, and the inspiring feature of it is found in the fact that this discussion of tariff reform, so quietly begun, is destined to widen until it embraces the whole brood of tariffs of every description in this tariff-ridden country. And this debate is none the less important for the reason that it was inaugurated in the interest of relief from but one of the important tariffs of the long list of unjust tariffs that are inflicted upon the people of this country in the interest of special lines of business and industries. This discussion is not only serving a great purpose in exposing these various tariffs, levied in the interest of the few upon the many, in their proper character and nature, and showing them all akin, being of a common parentage, greed, and sustained by a common method, the elimination of the principle of competition from the commerce of the country; but it is important in this, that it is stripping the mask from the face of fraudulent pretense and placing individuals as well as parties before the people for what they are rather than for what they profess to be. Through this debate and the discussion that it will inevitably lead to throughout the country there will be thrown a flood of light where light has long been sorely needed; and in this light the people of this country will see the real issues in which they are interested and be the better enabled to draw a line between their friends and their foes without accepting blindly as conclusive the party label on the sleeve.

And in the light that must come from a discussion of this tariff question in all its varied forms party lines will be reformed and political organizations will come to stand for living, vital, modern questions as well as sacred memories, and the beginning of the end of the days of the politician who has exalted past party virtue for the sole purpose of obscuring the present vicious methods in vogue everywhere in the commerce of the country will have come.

The great battle between monopoly and competition has begun, and in my judgment will be waged until the people shall have gained well-defined victory with practical and enduring beneficial results over the commercial monsters that have been too largely dominating the country, dictating its officary, and shaping its legislation.

Grave abuses exist everywhere in the name of commerce, and through these abuses colossal fortunes, aggregating an undue proportion of the nation's wealth, have been placed in the hands of a few individuals at the expense of the many.

And thus, in this Republic, founded on the principles of the equality of all men and industries before the law, we find that the grossest inequalities of the nation's forces have been built up through great commercial agencies exercising unrestrainedly in their right as their own private property the sovereign powers of the Government, which belong alone to the whole people.

This sovereign power of the people has been let to the banks to control the people's money, to the railroads to control the transportation of the people's commerce, to the telegraph to control the transmission and dissemination of the people's news, and to the jobbers and the manufacturers to control the prices of the people's food and clothing and the other necessities of life, until we find the Government an indorser without profit in all these gigantic agencies wielded by individual hands, directed by individual heads, in the sole interest of strictly private citizens.

This class of men, panoplied with the usurpation of this sovereign power, have so far abused their trust as to be wrongfully extorting from the body of the people and putting into their own private coffers more than a billion annually of the people's hard-earned money. This monstrous condition of affairs has borne its legitimate fruit, and we see springing up everywhere as the hateful progeny of this usurpation innumerable modern monsters, known as "trusts," all like their more respectable, and for that reason more dangerous, predecessors, sired by greed and damed by contrivance that eliminates from American commerce the vital principle of honest competition. And through the demoralization that has resulted from this course of commercial conduct we have reached a point where lead in the dice represents the genius of American enterprise and the Government of the United States is looked to as the common agent to place the dice or keep watchful ward over the agency that does. And all this in the sacred name of the development of the commerce and the industries of the country and to protect American labor. No business enterprise in this day of pools, tariffs, and trusts is regarded as worthy the attention of a really great business man that does not afford its proprietor some undue advantage over his competitors and his customers, enabling him to drive the former out of business and to com-

pel the latter to deal with him on such terms as he shall dictate with no other limitation on his greed than his own sense of policy may suggest.

That this principle is as actively present under the practical operation of a tariff levied with a view to protection as it is under the operations of a pooling arrangement between railroad companies or trust combines, by which they forestall the market value of the articles and commodities in which they deal, is so self-evident that it needs no proof. In both instances the object is the extinction of competition, and the difference between the two is one of degree measured by the distance each halts short of reaching a point of absolute prohibition. That one relates to foreign and the other to domestic trade can make no sort of difference so far as the principle of discrimination is concerned. All concede that as to domestic affairs the principle is odious and not to be tolerated, but as to foreign affairs some contend that it is a blessing for which we should all be devoutly thankful. That there is a distinction between being extorted from by home-folk and those you know and by foreigners and mere strangers, I am willing to concede; but that there is such a distinction as to convert that which is crime in the former to beneficence in the latter I most emphatically deny, and I need only call up the farmer of the West, and especially those in the district which I have the honor to represent, who are paying the coupons of pool and protection agents, which are contrived on and clipped from every industry and calling they pursue, in order to furnish an unbroken line of testimony in support of the proposition I here affirm. A more fertile and Heaven-favored country God in His most generous mood never made than that which the farmers of the West occupy; and a more honest, intelligent, sober, economical, and industrious people can not be found among the civilized peoples of the earth than are to-day tilling the soil of this great fertile West.

But notwithstanding Heaven's favor and their own inherent virtue, the balance of trade is against that section of country, and the mortgages that plaster the homes of the people stand for the difference, and represent the price they pay through one protective contrivance and another, like the pool, for the development of every "home" industry save their own. They pay the extortionate rates of the railroad pool, the telegraph pool, the insurance pool, the coal pool, the coal-oil pool, the corn pool, the wheat pool, the lumber pool, the salt pool, the sugar pool, the manufacturers' pool, the jobbers' pool, and the various other pools of this pool-cursed country, and then, in consequence of the necessities created by this series of exhaustive processes, they are compelled to borrow their own money back from another class of pool agents at extortionate rates of interest. This is the same principle that our protection friends grow so fervidly eloquent about as it works in that portion of our country characterized by some Eastern friend, no doubt an ardent protectionist, as the "rowdy West."

Our farmers in the West are more and more coming to understand that the beauties of protection, as portrayed by its advocates, relate to the condition of those who are the beneficiaries of the system, and not to those who foot the bills. But do not understand from what I here say, as to the balance of trade being against the farmers of the West and as to mortgages that rest upon their homes to meet that balance, that the people of that section of the country are in a forlorn and hopeless condition. I mean nothing of the kind. The farmers of the West are a proud, and, considering their condition, a prosperous people, and with a fair fight a great future before them. But what I do mean to say is that there is unjust discrimination against them; that there are unjust and onerous limitations placed upon them and their industry, and that the contest that they are engaged in with the agents of the protective pools of the country, backed by the sovereign power of the Government, is an unequal contest. And it is for the reason that the discussion of that phase of protection involved in the pending measure will arrest the attention of the public and lead to the discussion of protection in general that I hail with unfeigned pleasure the present debate.

When the smoke of battle shall have lifted from the field and the people calmly and dispassionately consider the facts as they shall then appear, they will see that a pool is a pool; that a trust is a trust; that protection is protection, whether relating to foreign or domestic concerns, the leading, vital principle of the life of all of them being the extinction of the principle of competition. Protection without proper restraint means monopoly, and both mean death to the most vital and efficacious principle of American commerce—competition. Competition means fair play, monopoly means foul play; and it means foul play on the highest authority, for it surrounds men with conditions of temptation that subvert all honesty and lead us up to where we can appreciate as never before, perhaps, the full force and meaning of that portion of the Lord's Prayer which prescribes the absence of temptation as the condition on which man shall gain the kingdom of heaven. But as odious as the principle may be, its application may be at times, and doubtless is as necessary in the complex affairs of state as the deadly poisons are necessary in the practice of the life-saving science of medicine.

But happily for the country the time has come when the farmers of the great West have such time for thought and action with reference to their own affairs as to see to it that a line of policy is marked out that has a tendency to equalize the burdens and the benefits between the

different sections of the country and the industries peculiar to each. And speaking for myself as a citizen of one of the great commonwealths of the West, which I have the honor in part to represent, I will say that the West will meet this question in the broad-minded, generous spirit with which she has ever come to the discharge of all her duties to the Republic, but in so doing she will endeavor to disabuse the minds of our Eastern protection friends of the impression they seem to have gained, from the expressions of Western representatives with Eastern ideas, that we are such dull, obtuse, and easily deceived people as not to be able to tell a burden from a blessing, and that in acquiescing in the policy of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection we are doing it in obedience to duty, undeceived by the sophistries of the modern protectionist, who is ready to ascribe to his idol all the blessings that have come to man in this goodly-land. The matter of tax-paying is business and not pleasure, and no amount of sophistry can make it seem otherwise.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates the needs of the Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1888, and ending June, 1889, at \$326,530,000. He also estimates that there will come into the Treasury within that time from—

Customs duties.....	\$228,000,000
Internal revenue.....	120,000,000
All other sources.....	35,000,000

Making a total of..... 383,000,000

being \$56,470,000 in excess of the needs of the Government for the ensuing year.

All, or nearly all, agree that there should be such a recast of the revenue laws of the country as to leave that excess of \$56,470,000 in the pockets of the men whose rightful property it is.

All, or nearly all, agree that the obligations of the Government, economically administered, are the just measure of taxation.

To meet these obligations is stern business, and no array of figures nor labyrinths of statistics can obscure the fact that the identical people who pay this great sum of \$326,530,000 are the people who buy the articles on which this burden directly and indirectly rests. This much is clear, and the protectionist, feeling that the burden is on him to do so, in view of this mighty contribution to his business of \$228,000,000 by the consumers of his goods, endeavors to show by one intellectual invention and another that each of these contributors to protection has had a benefit in the development of home industries and the increased wages of labor.

Concede this statement to be literally true, and it is the most non-sensical investment that a people ever made, of two hundred and twenty-eight millions of money. Look at a few figures and contemplate a few facts deducible therefrom, and you will reach the conclusion that as a mere investment the proprietors of this cash had better bought stock in the Standard Oil Trust or have started a new one on their own hook. According to the Tenth Census—

The whole population was.....	50,155,783
Total number engaged in manufactures and mining.....	3,837,112

Total..... 46,348,671

Here we have 46,348,671 people paying \$186,522,065 of money to maintain an increase in the wages of 3,837,112, or at the rate of \$48.61 + per head for every man, woman, and child thus employed, or \$4.02 per head for the 46,348,671; or for the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent, the farmers would have paid the enormous sum of \$683,400 for the development of industries they did not own and to increase the wages of people they did not employ. And on the estimates of this year by the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of import duties will reach \$228,000,000, which will amount to \$4.27 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, or \$725,900 for my Congressional district. But we can not concede only momentarily for the sake of argument the claims of the protectionists. Our farmers know that as a common contribution to our country the development of industries in which they have no pecuniary interest is something to be proud of, but they know that glory as a diet is exceedingly thin, and that as raiment it is too diaphanous for the temperate in which they live to be of any value.

And, Mr. Chairman, as to the claim that protection increases the price of labor, I have something to say. In the first place I deny that we are indebted to the tariff in any degree for the difference in wages in this country and in Europe. And in the second place, conceding for argument's sake the point, I deny that the pending measure proposes any such reduction of duties on imports as to interfere in the slightest degree with the wages of those employed in this country in the production of dutiable articles, and on these points I desire to submit proof which, in my judgment, conclusively sustains them both. The higher wages paid labor in this country are due to several causes, and none of those the tariff, for while on that specious pretext the manufacturers have been protected to an extent that enabled them to execute their purpose, they have, in every instance, proved recreant to their professions of friendship to labor, and have taken the proceeds of the protective legislation, generously given them in the interest of their workmen, and coolly put it in their own pockets; and as the absence of evidence is sometimes as strong as affirmative proof, I point to the re-

markable fact that the entire history of protective legislation, so far as my research goes, fails to disclose a single instance where the wages of the laborer in a given industry were increased by reason of the imposition of an import duty or the increase of a duty already imposed.

It is true that as to this question, as to most others, they present columns of figures showing that wages in this country are higher than in other countries, and then presumptuously claim the difference as a trophy of protection. And while there is no proof that the tariff has anything to do with the increase of wages, there are many circumstances, like the varying wages in adjacent cities with the same tariff conditions, that abundantly prove that the lion's share of the benefits (as is notably shown in the steel-works of Edgar Thomson) given the American manufacturer goes into the pockets of the rich proprietor. Among the leading and prime conditions which account for the greater wages American laborers receive over foreign laborers is in the superiority of American labor, and on that point I submit as high protective authority an extract from a letter by Hon. W. M. EVARTS, then Secretary of State and now a Republican United States Senator from New York, transmitting to Congress May 17, 1879, the consular reports on the state of labor in Europe. He says:

The average American workman performs from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman. This is so important a point in connection with our ability to compete with the cheap labor manufactures of Europe, and it seems at first thought so strange, that I will trouble you with somewhat lengthy quotations from the reports in support thereof. * * *

For the first time our manufactures are now assuming international proportions. At a time of universal depression we have met those nations which held a monopoly of the world's markets, met them in their strongholds, etc. * * * Within the last fifteen years we have demonstrated our ability by the brilliant development of our own resources to exclude by honest competition foreign manufactures to a large extent from our shores.

But if this superiority of American labor over the pauper labor of Europe did not more than account for the difference in wages, still the American manufacturer would have no cause of complaint against the pending bill, as the per cent of duty imposed on every article is in every instance largely in excess of the per cent. which the labor represents in the article produced in this country.

Making protection to American labor the leading ground for asking laws protecting them from foreign competition with the cheap products of pauper labor, the American people have consented to take upon themselves the great burden of adding, as the law stands at present, 47 per cent. to the price of the whole range of dutiable articles, which, taking the estimated value of such articles at \$2,500,000,000, and one-half the duty as added to the price, we have the enormous sum, in round numbers, of about \$600,000,000 that the American laborer should receive. The following table of statistics, prepared by Mr. Seaton, Superintendent of the Tenth Census, and extended to show the present and proposed tariff rates by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], demonstrates the fact that as to the articles named in the table labor receives only 16.9 per cent., while the per cent. of protection demanded for it by the manufacturer and generously accorded by the people amounts to 69 per cent.:

Table, compiled from the Tenth Census, showing value of various manufactured products, per cent. of labor cost, rate of duty existing and proposed.

Industries.	Value of product.	Labor.	Percentage of labor.	Present tariff.	Proposed rate.
				Per ct.	Per ct.
Carpets.....	\$31,792,802	\$6,835,218	21.5	47	40
Cotton goods.....	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	50	40
Bolts, nuts, etc.....	10,073,330	1,981,800	19.7	59	35
Nails and spikes.....	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	43	34
Iron pipe, wrought.....	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	70	35
Oil, castor.....	653,900	44,714	6.8	194	97
Oil, linseed.....	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	54	21
Screws.....	2,184,532	456,542	20.9	50	35
Wool hats.....	8,516,569	1,898,215	22.2	54	40
Woolen goods.....	160,606,721	25,836,392	16.1	70	40
Worsted goods.....	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	68	40

This exhibit discloses the fact that the manufacturers have not dealt in good faith with this question, and that they have cheated both the people and their employes, or, in other words, are guilty of obtaining money under false pretenses. On this estimate they have retained 52.1 per cent. of the amount granted them on account of labor, and the mild form of punishment they receive at the hands of the pending measure, which is characterized by the protectionist advocates as "an assault upon home industries," is a reduction of duties to such a point only as leaves them an average of 40.7 per cent., or 23.8 per cent. more than the average wages the manufacturers are now paying their employes. It would seem that on this showing the American manufacturer, tempering his greed with prudence, would be less presumptuous in his demands and less offensive and provocative in his treatment of his victims.

Here he stands as the exponent of a system that has filched from the people hundreds of millions annually on one false pretense and another,

not only not offering to make any restitution to the laboring men of these millions whose property it equitably and rightfully is, but is fighting with the desperation of a wild beast to prevent any modification of this great burden of extortion in the future. Protectionists might as well understand that this fight is on to a finish, and that there will be no rest in this country until this system of plundering the American people in the name of American labor shall be torn, root and branch, from our revenue policy and cast out forever. And certainly every laboring man in whose name this outrage is committed is interested in seeing this end accomplished, or at least in seeing that there is a division of the spoils in harmony with the conditions on which it is procured.

In truth, evidence multiplies on every hand that the manufacturer, the capitalist, and not the laborer, is the beneficiary of our protective system. Were it not so, Mr. Chairman, instead of bringing into this country in great numbers pauper laborers of Europe to take the place of American laborers, our protection friends would join in the movement to put a high protective duty on such labor importations and thus show themselves not only the friends of the laboring man but consistent protective tariff advocates.

And the laboring man is not such a fool as not to know that it is a much graver crime against him and his family to import pauper labor to drive him out of business or bring him down to starvation wages than it is to import merely the product of that pauper labor. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent by these protected industries in preparing arguments bristling with statistics to show the blessings of taxing one class of people to sustain the business of another class of people, and great enterprise and ingenuity, without regard to expense, is exhibited in placing these arguments where they will do the most good.

They are made to appear as original matter in an editorial way, as the disinterested sentiments of the editor, and they are sent in season and out the year round into the homes of the farmers and others of their victims in order to hold them in a state of repose. But when the argument has ended there appears but one fact beyond the realm of doubt, and that is the fact that the consumers of dutiable articles in this country, whether they be foreign or domestic, pay in excess of what they would have to pay but for the tariff, the tariff duty whatever it may be, whether 47 per cent. as now, or more or less. In other words, if the tariff is at the rate of 47 per cent. of the value of dutiable goods the consumers pay an excess of 47 per cent. over and above what they would pay but for the tariff. The importer adds the tariff among other items to the cost of his goods, and then meets the price fixed by the American merchants on his goods, and thus the consumers in each instance pay the enhanced price, and if the amount required by consumers be three billions, one billion four hundred and ten million represents the price they have paid to aid home industries. Of course these figures may not be correct in every instance, but they are approximately so as a basis of calculation for all practical purposes in illustrating in greater or less degree the sum of the burden borne by the American people in the name of protection to American industries.

Vehement denial that the duty is added to the cost and specious arguments to show that dutiable articles are produced in this country as cheaply as abroad are all, no matter how plausible, tainted with fraud, doubt, and great uncertainty, in view of a few established facts about which there never has been any doubt. And the skeptic is altogether pardonable, for he sees the American manufacturer spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the European manufacturer out of the American market, and he sees the European manufacturer so eager to get into this market that he is willing to pay about \$225,000,000 per annum for the mere chance of having his products exposed in our markets. The American manufacturer is fleecing his victims at such a rate that the European manufacturer can afford to pay \$225,000,000 per annum for a stand in our market-place. This is a condition and not a theory. And while there is but one single fact about which there is no controversy, and that the fact that the consumers of the classes of articles subject to duty pay the duty, all else as to offsets and the like being mere speculation on the part of the protectionist, the wiser and safer practice is to hold fast to the path marked out by the fathers of the Republican party before the various protected interests had assumed such vast proportions and had gained as undue and as dangerous a power over the minds of men as they have over the commerce and industries of the country.

The Republican party recognized this rule and applied it in legislation, and if their voice could be heard to-day a vast majority of the people (of Iowa at least) would declare in favor of a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, in such sum as, added to the internal-revenue taxes paid in under existing laws, would meet the just obligations of the Government, honestly and economically administered. When I ask my neighbor to pay me \$2 for an article, the product of my labor, that he can buy across the way for \$1, there rests on me a decisive burden to explain to my neighbor how on business principles he can afford to do that thing, and the explanation will be largely in the nature of the venerable and often-told story in which a white man and an Indian and a turkey and a buzzard were the leading characters. Of the \$228,000,000, the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the receipts of the Government for the ensuing year from tariff

duties, 100,000,000 at least will be paid by the farmers, estimating their numbers at the moderate sum of 44 per cent. of the population of the United States; and they will pay it because they have to pay it as good citizens, and not for the reason that they regard it a privilege and a blessing.

They know they must bear their just proportion of the tax, and that to pay it in this disguised way, when they have some voice in determining the amount of it, more or less, as they will to buy more or less of dutiable articles, is perhaps quite as satisfactory as to pay a fixed sum over the Treasurer's counter, as they do as to State and county taxes, and which if not paid exposes their property to distraint and sale. But the tax-payers of the Eighth Iowa district, which I have the honor to represent, in paying \$725,900, their proportion of the \$228,000,000, the estimate for the current year, will demand that there be such a reduction of the revenues as will bring this enormous burden to the smallest possible amount. And the people of Iowa are in such earnest mood on this and kindred subjects that no amount of sophistry as to benefits accruing from protection nor juggling as to the non-partisan character of the question will induce them to forego holding individuals personally responsible for their official action. A Representative will not this year be permitted to vote with the trusts and then plead in his defense that his action was not political action.

Nothing but large and well-trained majorities, held together by force of habit, from long association and prejudice, and other than by principle, will return an Iowa member this year who, on any pretext, does not vote for a reduction of the excessive taxation that, in connection with other drains from other protected industries, is draining Iowa annually of her substance and putting \$100,000,000 per annum in the Treasury more than is needed to meet the obligations of the Government. From long suffering the people have been seeking light, and, in my judgment, the time has come when the cry of "free trade" and "British gold" will no longer divert the attention of the taxpayer from the hand that, during the diversion thus created, glides deftly into his breeches pocket.

The nation is at peace within its own borders and with the world. We have had now more than three years' Democratic administration, and there is no rent in the flag and no stoppage of Union soldiers' pensions or payment of the rebel debt. The time has come when the people can look after their own private interests, as contradistinguished from public affairs, without endangering the public weal. There is no longer any call to sacrifice personal for public interests. If the regulation of the tariff, the railroads, the telegraphs, the banks, and the trusts are not political and party questions, the people will make them party questions, and men who wish to remain in public life that do not seek to find some way of putting these institutions on an equality with the ignored farmers, who stand for one-half—and the better half—of the industry of this country, to the end that the hundreds of millions that the farmers are now paying in extortionate rates into custom-houses, railroad and telegraph offices, and banks, will be notified that their services are no longer wanted.

One of the most forceful schemes on the part of this combination of interests against the people has been the non-partisan dodge by which they (the pool agents) have maintained the equality of political forces by keeping one party as deep in the mire as the other in the mud, and the people left without any inducement to change their party relations. In my own State, where I am familiar with men and methods, the audacity of the corporation bosses, who associate themselves with the dominant party for the purpose of directing its course in the interest of monopolistic power, is largely born of the fact that a few leaders admitted to the councils of the minority share with them in their devotion to monopoly as well as in the spoils that follow such devotion.

TARIFF.

For the purpose of opening up the way for men who want the benefits of belonging to party, and also want the benefits that accrue from doing those things that are in violation of party promises and party tradition, an ingenious way has been opened up that is worthy of the inventive ingenuity of the pool agents of the day. The declaration has gone out that the tariff is not a political question, and that therefore no party sin can be committed in relation to it, let the action of the individual be what it may. That this will prove as weak as most of the other propositions the agents of monopoly seek to sustain their cause with will appear when it is stated that according to Worcester's dictionary politics is defined as "the science or the art of government, or the administration of national or public affairs; that part of ethics which consists in the knowledge or practice of conducting the various affairs of a State or nation." It strikes me that raising the revenues is a part of the various "affairs" involved in "conducting the affairs of the State or nation." If on the leading question in politics, committed to the leading committee of the House, and whose chairman is conceded to be the leader of the House, party lines can not be drawn, it is a strong point made in support of the common charge, now so frequently heard everywhere, that parties have outlived their usefulness and are only able to draw the lines on historical questions, always breaking on all questions affecting banks, railroads, telegraphs, trusts, and other Government-aided enterprises that are making private merchandise of the sovereign power of the people. The tariff question is a

political question, and the Republican party has so recognized it, and has a well-defined position with reference to it, notwithstanding the fact that some of its self-constituted leaders are trying to harness it up in the interest of monopoly. The party faith, as formulated in its platforms and through the utterances of party leaders, as well as the general line of legislation it has enacted since it came to power, bind the party to the policy of a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to encourage home industry. In view of the fact that the Constitution limits the tariff to the revenue needs of the Government, and the further consideration, of a practical nature in the working out of that policy under the constitutional limitation, that the annual receipts from tariff are now about \$225,000,000, and that Senator SHERMAN, a protectionist, and probably, from his long experience in public affairs of a financial character, the highest authority in the land, said, in a speech delivered in 1869, that—

The wit of man could not possibly devise a tariff that would yield \$140,000,000 in gold without amply protecting our domestic industry—

there does not seem to be any other tenable ground for the party to stand on. The whole history of the party as a party shows this. The Whig party was the original tariff party in this country, and Henry Clay was the oracle and idol of his party in general and on that question in a special sense. Henry Clay, advocating this position from the standpoint of a patriot and as to its effect upon the whole country, asked for a temporary protective tariff for our American industries during their infancy, which is the exact position of General James A. Garfield (the last President the Republican party elected), as he defined his position on this question as being in favor of such protection as would lead to free trade. When the Whig party went into bankruptcy the Republican party fell heir to the assets, and especially to its position on the tariff; and consequently President Garfield was voicing the organic law of his party on the tariff when he declared himself in favor of only such protection as would lead to free trade.

Chester A. Arthur, elected as Vice-President upon the ticket with Garfield, and whose admirable administration as Garfield's successor received the cordial indorsement of his party and made it possible for his party to prolong its power, declared in his last annual message in favor of—

such tariff reductions as may seem advisable when the result of recent revenue laws and commercial treaties shall have shown in what quarters those reductions may be most judiciously effected.

The "recent revenue laws" he there referred to as the result of the revision of 1883 were followed by increased, instead of reduced revenues, adding fresh force to his recommendation and proving the soundness of his political views. President Arthur's policy was the party policy, and that was, only such import duties as, taken in connection with the revenue from other existing sources, were needed to meet the obligations of the Government honestly administered.

The protection spoken of in the party platforms was the protection that came from a wise adjustment of the duties imposed.

President Arthur had three Secretaries of the Treasury—Charles J. Folger, of New York, an Eastern State; and General Gresham and Hugh McCulloch, of Indiana, a Western State—and all three were able and trusted leaders of the Republican party, and all three were outspoken for tariff reform.

Secretary Folger, in his report for 1883, recommended—

That the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced.

And Secretary McCulloch, in pointing out in his report the proper way in which to do this, said:

1. That the existing duties upon raw materials which are to be used in manufacture should be removed.

2. That the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced.

Again I desire to call attention to the fact, in order to emphasize it as it deserves in these days, when the launching of the mere epithet of "free-trader" is expected to successfully degrade the work of tariff reform, that President Arthur's administration was not only a Republican administration but one that won exceptional commendation from his party, that found warm and generous expression in the resolutions of every party State convention held that year. Mr. Arthur's administration was but executing Republican principles in compliance with the Republican platforms; and the Chicago Tribune, the leading Republican newspaper in the United States, when measured by its devotion to the masses as against special interests, puts the situation in a nutshell and voices the sentiments of its party in the West when it says:

Thus the last Republican administration anticipated by four years the recommendation just made to Congress by Mr. Cleveland and laid down the precise doctrine which, coming from a Democratic President, is now expected to excite the abhorrence of Republicans.

And passing from national to State affairs, I find that the record of the Republican party in Iowa is well defined as being for tariff with incidental protection; and in proof of this allegation I will submit the platform utterances of the party, as I have them at hand, until at an unfortunate moment monopolistic power largely dominated the State and, taking advantage of the great diversion from its machinations created by the agitation of the prohibitory question, stole into the party

platform in 1883 a paragraph declaring against any tinkering with the tariff.

I have been a Republican from my youth up, following, in peace and war, the fortunes of my party banner without breach of discipline during all these years, save in two instances, the most notable one being when I gave my somewhat cordial support to the candidacy of an independent Republican. How many of my brethren on this side of the House can say as much? And, however much my action in these instances may be open to criticism by that class of Republicans who have just made their last return from their latest escapade into the Democratic party, it does not alter the record of the Republican party in my State nor my familiarity with it as a party to it. And I shall proceed to present it to the House.

In 1871 the Republican State convention declared—

That while we favor a just and reasonable degree of protection to all branches of American industry against foreign competition, we are unalterably opposed to any system of legislation which favors one section of the country or department of industrial enterprise at the expense of another, and therefore advocate such protection only as a fairly adjusted revenue tariff will afford.

In 1873—

That we demand a general revision of the present tariff laws that shall give us free salt, iron, lumber, cotton and woolen fabrics, and reduce the whole thing to a revenue basis only.

In 1875—

That we favor a tariff for revenue, so adjusted as to encourage home industry.

In 1877—

That we favor a wisely adjusted tariff for revenue.

In 1878—

That we favor a wisely adjusted tariff for revenue.

In 1879 the very same words occur in the eighth paragraph of the Republican platform. And as late as 1880 the then Republican governor of Iowa put a paragraph in his inaugural message speaking in hostile terms against the prohibitory duty of \$28 on steel rails as being a grievous burden on the farmers, by making railroad building more expensive and transportation of their products higher, and asking the Legislature to memorialize Congress to reduce or abolish the duty.

But, Mr. Chairman, soon after this corporate power in Iowa politics became bold, and even insolent, and when it could not control conventions and put such planks in the platform as it desired, it went to the Legislature and accomplished what it had failed to accomplish with delegates at conventions fresh from the country. A great change, however, has taken place within the party within the last two years. The party, enraged by the shameful manner in which it had been misrepresented in a legislative way, arose in its might and displaced the recreant public servants in such decisive numbers that the last Legislature of that State, which has just adjourned, enacted several propositions into law that former Legislatures had refused to listen to. Corporate monopoly power has received hard blows in Iowa within the last two years.

Its executive and legislative departments have been retrieved by the people, and with vigilance on the part of the earnest men of the party more valuable ground will be gained. Pools, trusts, special rates, and other monopolistic contrivances for the prevention of competition and the distribution of favors among the friends of corporate control have been legislatively denounced. And as high protective-tariff interests have everywhere made common cause with the railroads, the telegraphs, and the trusts, and advanced from the old-time doctrine of tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, to protection for the sake of protection, no matter how much money was thereby being taken from the people and hoarded in the Treasury, so this class of tariff pretensions have met the fate of the company they kept and have in Iowa retired to the old ground; and I have not the least doubt but that the wise heads of the party will advise a retreat on this question to the point it occupied before being carried away by the pools and the trusts. And Iowa's representative Republicans have been more outspoken in official life than even their party through its platform.

In July, 1866, the revision of the tariff was before the Congress. Then, as now, the high-tariff men were telling the West they would receive benefits in this way, and that when Hon. John A. Kasson, one of the ablest and most popular men Iowa ever produced, and whom it kept continuously in office until within the last three years, when he voluntarily retired, told the House such propositions were "illogical" and "absurd." "What you call protection," he said, answering the New England sophistries, "amounts, therefore, simply to an equal robbery; taking from one home interest to pay to another." The bill under discussion then was very similar to existing law. Again, in the same speech, speaking of the then pending bill, Mr. Kasson said:

And now what does this bill do? It raises the tariff on lumber, which is so necessary to the Western prairie farmer; on nails, without which he can not drive his boards on his house or build his fence; and on salt, without which he can not preserve his beef and pork. There is hardly a thing we consume which this bill forgets to raise the duty upon. Every prominent necessity of life, food, fuel, shelter, and clothing, is embraced and made more expensive to the consumer throughout the country. Even on boys' pocket-knives the duty is increased about three times, 600 per cent., one member of the committee tells me; and yet it is said this is a tariff for mere protection.

James W. Grimes, Iowa's first Republican governor, her most gifted Senator during the war, and whose history is one of the brightest lega-

cies Iowa has inherited, from his place in the Senate on January 24, 1867, the question of the tariff being under consideration, spoke as follows:

Mr. GRIMES. Mr. President, the man who opposes the passage of this bill must expect to be slandered. The "protectionists," as they choose to call themselves, have already opened the vials of their indignant wrath upon the heads of those whose opposition they anticipated. Threats of utter political extinction are hurled against every man who, in the exercise of an independent judgment, is not prepared to impose upon his constituents the burdens which the various manufacturing combinations demand. That portion of the public press suborned to their interest is rife with charges that "the Capital is thronged with free-traders, and that British gold is operating to secure American legislation for British interests." Every man is condemned in advance who would inquire before he would vote.

We know what all this means, and so far as I have the ability, I am resolved that the people shall know what it means.

It means that two or three large manufacturing interests in the country, not satisfied with the enormous profits they have realized during the last six years, are determined at whatever hazard to put more money in their pockets; and to this end they have persuaded some and coerced other manufacturing interests to unite with them in a great combination demand for what they call protection to American labor, but what some others call robbery of the American laborer and agriculturist. * * * It is the fashion to denounce every man who does not favor a prohibitory tariff as a free-trader. The charge is made that free-trade agents are at work to influence Congress, and that our tables are incumbered with free-trade documents. Who has seen these free-trade agents? I have yet to see the first man who was in favor of free trade, nor have I seen any man who was opposed to a revenue tariff which would incidentally protect such branches of American industry as needed the fostering aid of the Government. It is on questions of detail that we differ. We disagree as to now much money shall be taken from the pocket of Peter to support and enrich his brother Paul.

Hon. W. B. ALLISON is an Iowa Republican who has served in Congress since 1864, and was for some years a member of the Ways and Means Committee in this House. He is so strong with his party today in that State that it is presenting him with great earnestness as the proper man to receive the endorsement of his party at large as its candidate for the Presidency. And Senator ALLISON'S strength in Iowa is due to the defense he has made of Iowa interests, and especially with reference to the tariff. On March 24, 1870, in this House, discussing the tariff bill then pending, Senator ALLISON said:

The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product as well as in the number of persons employed. I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain-producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question yesterday stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about \$1.70 per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.

What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer, the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, he comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison to our own, as pauper labor.

But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles, and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our highly-taxed manufactures made from highly-taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

To the above remarks by Senator ALLISON I invite the attention of the House and country to show the position of the party and the people of his State; and to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], who seems to think the farmers of Iowa are sufficiently protected by the tariff on wheat, corn, and other farm products to equalize their benefits under the tariff with the manufacturers in whose special interest it was conceived and enacted, I kindly commend the views of his predecessor, who owes his political eminence to them, with the suggestion that he carefully revise his own sentiments in harmony therewith if he would realize the cherished hope of his friends to still further follow in the way opened up by his illustrious leader.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, it appears from an examination of the record that the weight of the evidence establishes the fact that the true position of the Republican is that of tariff for revenue with such adjustment as will afford incidental protection to our home industries. And this is undoubtedly the correct position.

As a Western man I have no sort of patience with that protection craze which has developed in this country in the form of trusts, having for their object the prevention of competition and fair play; and while the tariff is not responsible for all these trusts that are amassing large fortunes on unpaid stocks, the beneficiaries of our tariff laws have abused their trust to such an extent as to put the people who pay the bills on their guard. The history and growth of protection in this country prove this. In the first place, protection was only demanded for our "infant industries." Then, again, it was presented in the shape of a war necessity, to raise the extraordinary sums of money needed to defend the nation's life; and in this connection, in consideration of the heavy tax imposed upon manufactured articles under the internal-re-

venue system, the duties on imports were largely increased with the distinct pledge and understanding that when the internal-revenue taxes were removed the duties on imports levied to meet them should also be removed.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, who reported the bill to increase the duties on imports, stated that the increase was necessary as an "equivalent" to the internal-revenue taxes imposed on manufactured articles. This was in the long session of 1864, and at the close of his speech he made this distinct pledge:

This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must give it our support as such.

And again, as—

a war measure imposed by the necessities of the Government, the scarcity of laborers, and the enormous direct taxation.

From this history it appears that it was reserved for the later advocates of protection to put their claim on its own merit as a permanent system. The earlier advocates of protection and all those who spoke for it, up to the day when monopolistic power, through pools and trusts, began to feel that it owned the country, did not pretend that the manufacturers of this country needed legislative aid save in a temporary way, and the country, relying upon the good faith of the statements thus made, acceded to their demands. Protection has run nearly the whole gamut of subterfuges, pleading, among other things, its own infancy and its country's misfortunes as the different reasons why the people should give it aid, promising solemnly in each instance that when the reason for the tax had ceased the tax itself should cease. But the friends of this special interest are fertile in resources, and now, when infancy has passed, when the misfortunes of war are over and the taxes on manufactured products are removed and the people come to claim their own according to the bond, they are met with another subterfuge.

Recognizing a need of an apparent growth in grace, the alleged friends of protection are massing their forces on high moral grounds, and are now demanding that before the tax is removed from the poor man's necessities the tax must be taken from whisky and tobacco, but more especially from whisky. This is the last resort, and I trust it is doomed to meet the ignominious defeat it deserves. But why on any pretext longer dally on this subject? What promise has been kept? What promise has been made by the advocates of these high duties that they have not violated? Not only so, but in many instances we find the beneficiaries of this aid combining to regulate and forestall the market value of their own products and cheat the country out of the benefits of the promised competition among themselves after the country generously conceded them the protection asked from foreign competition.

With this kind of record before the country, can protectionists complain if some people should suspect protection capable of making common cause with the monopolistic interest of the country, and that the miraculous conversions to their cause that they parade as the result of honest research and enlightened understanding, are simply the effects of a prudent and well-disposed extension of the metallic influences of a most lucrative system. If protection has not been recreant to an indulgent people, it has been peculiarly unfortunate in the record it has made, and can not blame the people, and especially the farmers of the West, whose interest in any view of the case are most remote and most doubtful, for wanting a showing of assets and a general accounting of stock.

For these reasons the people of the West turn instinctively to a modification of the tariff for a reduction of the revenues to a point commensurate with the needs of the Government.

The pending measure does not meet my views, as I am opposed to any reduction of internal taxes, and would prefer a greater reduction of duty on sugar if not indeed its entire removal. But modification being one of the demands of the hour, differences as to details must give way to compromise if anything is to be accomplished and the country assured that its Representatives are not again violating faith and reaching the same end by another road that it reached in the previous House. My objection to the bill is that it does not sufficiently reduce the tariff duties and reduces internal-revenue taxes too much.

But I can not have my way, and as the bill leaves the duty at a higher average per cent. than former tariffs enacted by the special champions of protection, and is higher than is needed to cover any difference there may be between the price of labor in this country and foreign countries, and conflicts to as limited an extent with any special interests in my State, and especially the district I have the honor to represent, as any that is ever likely to meet the approval of a majority of this House, I am prepared to support the measure with some few modifications. And it is impossible for me to see what reasonable excuse a Western Representative can frame for his defense in voting against the bill in all cases where it does not encroach upon some special interest in the district in which the member may chance to live.

OTHER TARIFFS TO MODIFY.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other tariffs that need revising and reducing as well as the tariff on imports, and the leading one is the tariff the railways are imposing upon the domestic commerce of the country. And as these tariffs hunt in couples and constitute the component parts of a trap that catches the commerce of the country, foreign or domestic, whether it be going or coming, it is altogether pertinent to

this discussion to submit in this connection a few suggestions as to the imperfection of any tariff reform that does not radically reform the railway tariffs of the country. And this matter is of special interest to my section of the country, so far inland and from the leading markets, whether at home or abroad. Our farmers pay the extortionate rate of the railroad tariff going to market with their products, and they pay the manufacturer's tariff and the railroad tariff coming home with the necessities of life.

Our railroad establishment is a great blessing, yet dominating as it has, and still does, all other interests in this country, building up this point and crushing that, enriching one man and impoverishing another, corrupting with its vicious methods the entire business of the country, extorting hundreds of millions from the people each year in excess of reasonable charges for the services rendered, and corrupting the various departments of government, State and national, until the entire country seems helpless in the railway barons' grasp, it would be better that this country had struggled on with its old-fashioned methods of transportation if these great evils can not be arrested and forever prohibited.

The railroad companies, like the manufacturers of the country, have abused the generosity of the people who contributed of subsidy, both public and private, a large proportion of the capital which built the roads. And when, after the roads are built, equipped, and in running order, the people look over the account and find that these roads, notwithstanding the generous gifts of individuals, towns, cities, counties, States, and the United States—these highways are charged up to the country for transportation purposes at about three times what they are worth, and when they suggest some plan of adjustment or management that will have a tendency to equalize the burdens between the companies and the people they are set down as an unreasoning, raw mob who are simply dissatisfied on account of the great distance they see between themselves and gentlemen who are able to be connected with the railway establishment of the country. And those who have been in authority have been so dead as to the trespasses and sins of this great establishment that but little progress has been made in the way of correcting the great abuses connected with it.

Built, as I have said, largely by public and private subsidy, this establishment is charged up to the country at an enormous cost, which, with the tremendous power it has in commanding the highways, makes the contest between it and other industries a most unequal one.

These various lines, according to Poor's Manual, had in operation in 1886 125,146 miles of road charged up to the country in capital stock, and debt at more than \$8,000,000,000, with earnings to the amount of about \$800,000,000, whilst for the year 1887, Mr. Poor says, at page 10 of his Manual for 1887, that—

The earnings for 1887 are likely to equal \$900,000,000, the increase to equal fully 10 per cent. over that of 1886.

And from the same authority we learn that the roads earned \$305 per mile more in 1886 than they did in 1885, and he adds that—

Hereafter it seems probable that the earnings of our railroads are to increase in ratio considerably greater than the amount of capital invested in them.

And for the benefit of those who are endeavoring to make the people think the interstate-commerce law of last year is a thing of virtue, I call attention to Mr. Poor's observation that—

The general managers of our great lines feel themselves to be much more masters of the situation, as it were, than for some years past.

And this is perfectly natural, as I shall endeavor to show before I finish. This railroad establishment is the most costly one in existence on the earth, and unless put under stringent legal control will make itself such complete "masters" of the entire country that the people will practically be transferred from a republic to an amalgamated corporation. The entire obligations of this Government for the ensuing year are estimated at \$326,000,000, and yet the railroads taxed the people of this country, according to Mr. Poor, for the year 1887, \$900,000,000, or nearly three times as much as the United States charged the people to run the machinery and discharge the obligations of the Government.

These railroads have a funded debt that is as much a debt and charge on the people as the debt of the United States, and that debt is this year about the enormous sum of \$4,000,000,000 or \$1,300,000,000 larger than the debt of the United States at the close of the war, and on this debt the companies are making the people pay a greater interest than they are paying on the Government debt. And the whole stands for fraud and ought to be wiped out of existence. When a farmer puts a mortgage on his farm it goes on as an incumbrance, and he is hard pressed till it is removed; whereas a railroad company may be characterized as a creature organized for the express opportunity of going into debt, and the peculiarity is that the more the company becomes indebted the richer becomes its proprietor, for it has methods which enable it to fix its value at any arbitrary sum it pleases and levy contributions on the people of the surrounding country to make that valuation sound and reliable. Peter A. Dey, a railroad commissioner of Iowa, first chief engineer of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and a thoroughly competent man in his profession, testified before the Pattison Pacific Railroad Commission last year that the Union Pacific road could be replaced, equipped, for \$25,000 per mile, and I doubt not

that the entire system in the United States could be replaced at that figure, or perhaps less, which would put their value at about \$3,000,000,000.

If this be true these railroads are costing the country this year in excess of a reasonable charge for their services as common carriers about the sum of \$600,000,000, which, in connection with the \$550,000,000 it is estimated the people pay on account of tariff duties, is the snug sum of \$1,150,000,000, which annual drain from the people accounts for the fabulous fortunes so suddenly made by the railroad and trust barons of the country. The prices of all property, save railroad and trust property, fluctuate and vary being affected by the surroundings; but the stocks and bonds of railroads, let the property cost what it may, been ever so extravagantly built, and when prices of labor and materials were high, let these all vary, and come and go in price as they may with good and hard times, railroad stocks and bonds, the alleged cost of the roads, stand as steady as the earth that is checkerboarded with their mileage. The people saw this great wrong, and they asked that they have such legislation as would right it. They demanded that the pool by which the companies fixed arbitrarily the charges for transportation, thereby fixing arbitrarily the value of railroad property, be prohibited, and that the companies be denied the power of favoritism called special rates by which they have been able to transform old-fashioned bribery into a "common courtesy."

The people made demand that pools and special rates, the twin abominations by which the railroads have placed every other industry in this country at their feet, should be taken out of the hands of the companies as power too dangerous to trust in the hands of anybody. With competition restored, favoritism abolished, rates would seek their level like other property, and the equilibrium be restored. The companies saw the rage of the people; and, taking time by the forelock, they find themselves entrenched behind a commission, the dumping ground of legislative responsibility, and the result is that rates are increased, the roads are made to earn \$305 per mile more than before the law was enacted, and in the language of Mr. Poor, an authority on that subject, "The managers of our great lines feel themselves to be much more masters of the situation, as it were, than for some years past." The "managers" feel that they have something that their friends can keep the country quiet with, until they see how the "experiment" works, and the companies know that by that time they will be the better enthroned and established through judicial and legal barricade in the possession of their ill-gotten gains and fictitious values.

These companies know that any public and governmental recognition they can have from their present standpoint of fraudulent stocks and bonds and values in general is in the direction of giving them character and stability. Hence they regard the interstate-commerce law, with a commission provided for that treats with them as an honorable establishment on an honest and sound basis, as a step in the direction of a general curative statute, and "they feel more like masters of the situation than they have for years." And when the first act of the commission was to suspend the law pending investigation, instead of after investigation, it looked as though the companies had made no mistake.

And when, on reading the first annual report of that august tribunal instituted to execute a law to prevent and break up certain practices on the part of the railroad companies of the country, we find that it simply offers an apology on behalf of the companies to show why they are not complying with the most important provisions of the law, the people of this country will be the more confirmed in the opinion that the railroad managers knew what they were doing, and that the people in asking for bread received a stone.

I have given this matter attention, and I do not believe there is substantial compliance with the law, or ever will be until the discretionary power exercised by the companies by virtue of the words "undue" and "unreasonable" and "like circumstance and condition" is taken root and branch out of their hands, their schedules of rates required to be posted where men can see them instead of filed away in drawers in the office of the Interstate Commerce Commission, where it takes three days to find them after you get to the office, and State courts given jurisdiction for the enforcement of rights under the law, instead of practically denying parties aggrieved a day in court by sending them to United States courts or the United States commission. And to show that in the matter of rates the companies are ignoring both the law and the commission and furnishing grounds for the next annual apology on the part of the commission, I submit the following extracts from schedules of rates in the office of the commission as they were prepared for me by Mr. C. C. McCain, the competent and courteous auditor of that body:

Rates from Chicago to New York.

Class.	All rail.	Via lake.	Class.	All rail.	Via lake
1.....	\$0.75	\$0.60	4.....	\$0.35	\$0.30
2.....	.65	.52	5.....	.30	.25
3.....	.50	.40	6.....	.25	.20

Rates to Chicago from Kansas City and Council Bluffs.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$0.75	A.....	\$0.30
2.....	.60	B.....	.25
3.....	.40	C.....	.20
4.....	.30	D.....	.17½
5.....	.25	E.....	.16

Rates to New York from Burlington, Dubuque, and Davenport.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$0.91½	4.....	\$0.42½
2.....	.79½	5.....	.36½
3.....	.61	6.....	.30½

Rates from Denver to New York.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$2.20	A.....	\$1.10
2.....	1.85	B.....	1.00
3.....	1.60	C.....	.85
4.....	1.30	D.....	.85
5.....	1.10	E.....	.75

Rates from Denver to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$1.80	A.....	\$0.90
2.....	1.46	B.....	.81
3.....	1.34	C.....	.70
4.....	1.12	D.....	.60
5.....	.90	E.....	.50

Rates from Dubuque, Davenport, and Burlington to Chicago.

Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.	Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.
1.....	\$0.40	A.....	\$0.14
2.....	.30	B.....	.12
3.....	.20	C.....	.11
4.....	.15	D.....	.09
5.....	.10	E.....	.08

Rates from Des Moines to Chicago.

Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.	Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.
1.....	\$0.62	A.....	\$0.24
2.....	.52	B.....	.22
3.....	.35	C.....	.17½
4.....	.25	D.....	.14½
5.....	.18	E.....	.12

Rates from Creston to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$0.73	A.....	\$0.28
2.....	.59	B.....	.25
3.....	.40	C.....	.20
4.....	.28	D.....	.17
5.....	.23	E.....	.14

Rates from Bedford to Chicago, and from Sidney to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1.....	\$0.75	A.....	\$0.30
2.....	.60	B.....	.25
3.....	.40	C.....	.20
4.....	.30	D.....	.17½
5.....	.25	E.....	.16

Respectfully, yours,

C. C. McCAIN, Auditor.

These tables show that the rate from Council Bluffs and Kansas City, about 500 miles, is as great as the rate from Chicago to New York, about 1,000 miles; and that the rate from Bedford, Iowa, to Chicago is as great as the rate from Kansas City over the same line in the same direction to the same destination, though the distance from Kansas City

to Chicago is about 150 miles greater than from Bedford. And the distance from Sidney, Iowa, to Chicago is 50 miles less than from Council Bluffs, and from Creston, Iowa, is 100 miles less, and yet the rate is substantially the same.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of the railroad establishment in this country to an equality with other industries is the first business of the hour. As the system stands at present it commands everybody and everything by the tremendous power it exercises over the highways, that power being as recklessly and as wantonly exercised as it ever was by the gentlemanly highwaymen of the olden time. And as it stands at present the people are as helpless in the grasp of railroad managers, who are "masters of the situation" in fact, and have as little to say as to how the \$900,000,000 is to be collected off them for transportation this year as he who at the muzzle of the highwayman's gun quietly gave up his purse. And those managers are not content with extorting from the people more than half a million money directly as common carriers, but they organize commercial companies along the line of their roads, and through the preference the managers of the roads can give those companies as special rates enable them to drive into bankruptcy and out of business all competition. The Standard Oil trust, that has absorbed hundreds of millions of the people's money, could not have been a thing possible but for the unlawful and vicious contracts it had with transportation lines.

And along the line of all these roads, and notably along the line of the Union Pacific Railway, commercial companies are organized whose owners control the transportation lines they are situated on, and through special rates granted them are enabled to bankrupt and drive out of business all competition, so that the people are left utterly helpless in the hands of the railroad managers not only as to the price of transportation but as to the price of all that is transported. Under these circumstances it is not at all strange that farm lands and farm products should be steadily declining all the time, and that railroad property, and the stocks of any trust with arrangements for special rates from a railway company, should be steadily appreciating in value and scarcely obtainable in the open markets. These great wrongs must be crushed out of existence. If the laws were as they should be in this country, and those laws were decently enforced, the proprietors of such conspiracies for forestalling the market value of products and to prevent the due course of trade and commerce would be convicted of felonies and sent to prison, where they would properly belong.

The great West is suffering more to-day from the abuse in railway tariffs than from the abuse in high impost duties. But she is suffering from both, and she joins hands cordially with the tariff reformers in the reduction of duties, and she asks them to join hands with her in her effort to reduce the charges of railroad transportation, which at the present time are at least 50 per cent. higher than honesty and good conscience demand.

The great West, the granary of the world, is charged so much for transportation that all her profits are absorbed in going to market, and the cheap products of the outside world come to her with high tariff duties and high freight rates added, so that between the upper and the nether mill-stones of tariff for revenue and tariff for railroads the great West is dispoiled of her substance, and seems to be left the common prey of the manufacturers and common carriers of the country.

This condition of things will not much longer be tolerated by a brave and self-respecting people. Unrest is manifest everywhere. Labor unions, farmers' alliances, and numerous other organizations are forming, and while there is more or less lack of harmony, light is breaking and the day is not far distant when all these men, with common cause and common interest, will unite to overthrow the commercial monsters that are coining their sweat. And when they do who can doubt the result? Then will come legislation for men as well as commerce. And this legislation will be for the men who in time of peace create the nation's wealth and in time of war defend it with their lives.

The great contest in this country that we are now entering upon is one for the equality of commercial and industrial establishments before the law, as men are equal before the law. The people are awakening to the fact that after having contended in this country for more than a hundred years, in war and in peace, for the equality of all men before the law they are in danger of losing the fruits of their costly triumphs through a species of class legislation in the interest of certain industries.

The people can not cope with these Government-aided interests, whose agents, procurers, slanderers, and bribe-distributors throng the halls of all legislation in this country; and when they come to understand that this is the source of the inequalities that exist and the prolific source of all the extortionate burdens they bear they will unite their straggling forces, and with the same invincible power with which they slew the monster of human slavery at the South they will slay this more modern monster that is seeking to enslave all men who eat their bread in the sweat of their face, and again place the Government in the hands of the whole people, where it rightfully belongs.

The following colloquy took place during the foregoing speech:

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Will my friend permit a question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My friend will observe that the protective.

system regulates competition between our own country and other countries, to make it fair, just, and humane, while combines and trusts destroy all competition. That is the difference.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I think the gentleman will find his question answered fully and emphatically in the course of my remarks.

Mr. CHADLE. Mr. Chairman, the presence of a large surplus in the national Treasury has inspired the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber to deliberately attack the industrial system inaugurated by the Republican party in 1861; a system which has brought marvelous prosperity and industrial development to the whole country; a system which in twenty-two years time, since the close of the war, has brought into the Treasury enough money to defray the current expenses of Government, bring its depreciated paper money up to par with gold and silver, and enable the Government to refund the war debt at a much lower rate of interest, pay off seventeen hundred millions of dollars of the principal of the war debt, and collect into the Treasury the present surplus—a system that has attracted and now commands the admiration of the ablest political economists and wisest statesmen in the world.

A system that has produced such results must possess intrinsic merit, must be based upon wise, conservative, sound, economic principles, and before we, the representatives of the nation that has under its prospering provisions achieved so many industrial victories and such marvelous increase of wealth, consent to set it aside and make a change, it will be the part of wisdom to know that the new system, the one proposed for adoption, will be able to afford wiser safeguards to American industrial development.

PROTECTION THE CENTRAL IDEA.

The central idea of the present system is the levying of duties on importations from foreign governments in conformity to a rule that will, while it brings into the national Treasury the required sum of money necessary to meet the demands of the Government, so arrange the levy that American goods, wares, and merchandise shall be protected from free and unrestricted competition with those of foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, this principle that has been tested for a period of twenty-seven years under the greatest possible variety of conditions; tested in time of war and in time of peace; tested with a depreciated paper currency and with a circulating medium redeemable in coin and equal to it in purchasing value; a principle that has proven by that fairest, safest, and best of all tests, experience, to be equal to any and all demands that can be made upon it, to be set aside, and for what reason? Because, notwithstanding it has accomplished all, yes, much more than its most sanguine advocates ever claimed it would, it has come to be considered by that modern Pericles of Democracy, President Cleveland, to be the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous source of unnecessary taxation."

The wise men of ancient and modern times have laid down this axiom—that there is no rule of guidance in human affairs so safe, none that can be so implicitly relied upon, as that of experience. This fact must hold good for special reasons in the consideration of all industrial questions.

Happily for all who may wish to contrast conditions and results under different industrial policies in the history of our Government, the past "rises before us like a dream," and we can see and know what results have been produced under tariff laws enacted and enforced in the interest of protection, and the results when the tariff laws have been enacted and enforced with the sole purpose in view of raising revenue to defray the expense of Government.

The lines of light and darkness are not more distinctly drawn in nature than are those of prosperity and prostration of business under these different industrial systems. I shall not go into a statistical statement to prove the facts stated in support of my views, but will say, quoting from the history of the past, that every one, not one, or two, or three, but every period of industrial development from the organization of the Government in 1789, to this good hour, every one of them, and all of them, were preceded by the adoption of a tariff so adjusted and levied as to afford protection to American goods, wares, and merchandise from open and unrestricted competition with foreign importations. This is the history of the past, and I group these eras after the second war with England as follows, from 1825 to 1833, from 1842 to 1846, and from 1861 to 1888.

I do not stop here. I am willing to go further, to accept other burdens, and to assert, and challenge successful contradiction of the truth of the statement I now make, that every single period of industrial and business depression and every financial disaster, with one single exception, and that phenomenal and growing out of the war, was preceded by a change in the manner of levying duties, whereby the feature of protection to American goods, wares, and merchandise was stricken out and tariff duties were levied for the sole purpose of providing revenue for the support of the General Government. I group these periods of industrial and business depression and financial disaster as follows: From 1817 to 1825, from 1833 to 1841, and from 1847 to 1861. There they are, gentlemen, recorded and of history, and it is from a careful study of these facts that we must reach a conclusion in reference to our duty in considering the pending bill.

Henry Clay, a leader of industrial thought, left it as his deliberate judgment that the period of most sweeping and universal depression

in all our commercial and industrial interests was from 1817 to 1825. By the terms of the treaty of Ghent, at the close of the war of 1812 between America and England, and at the request of the progenitors of the present Cobden Club, all the protective features of our tariff laws were removed, and duties were levied for the purpose of raising revenue only. Mr. Clay also declared that the eight years from 1825 to 1833 were the most prosperous in our history. What wand of progress touched our prostrate and perishing industries in 1825 and awakened them into not only a newness of life but to such marvelous development?

Mr. Chairman, I say to you, to the committee, and especially to my colleagues from the South, that if history and experience establish any one fact more clearly than any other, it is that it was the protective tariff of 1824, increased and amplified by the act of 1828. The people had been for eight years staggering under the revenue tariff of 1816; our industries were practically destroyed; labor was unemployed, except in agriculture, and want was an unbidden guest everywhere, when, in 1824, the protective features were restored to our tariff laws, and at once, and as if by magic, these industries awakened to a newness of life, and in less than eight years the whole current of events was changed. Labor was everywhere in demand at remunerative prices, and prosperity, such as our nation had not up to that time known, blessed all our people, blessed them through the diversification of labor industries and the consequent increased demand for labor. One would think that such an illustration would have caused the statesmen of that day to have permitted plenty to bless the land.

Mr. Chairman, history is ever repeating itself. The leaders of the section of the Union who are now demanding the repeal of the protective tariff of 1861 then demanded the repeal of the tariff of 1824 and 1828, and they succeeded, and the revenue tariff of 1832 was enacted and went into operation in 1833 and continued in force until 1842. Did it give the farmers, mechanics, and laborers relief? Did it bring prosperity to the country and plenty to the homes of those who toil? The history of that decade is one of widespread disaster. Loss to the capitalist. Loss to the business man. Loss to the farmers. Loss to the mechanic and artisan. The blight of industrial prostration rested like a cloud over all the country, until all the varied business and commercial interests were covered with it as the waters cover the deep. It is not strange that it was so.

Labor is king, the mightiest king that ever ruled the earth. Labor, when employed, is a powerful force, felt in every avenue of trade and business. Give labor employment at remunerative wages and nothing can impede the onward march of its progress. It lays its hands upon a wilderness, and it becomes a garden of roses and flowers. It wants the continent bound by bands of steel, and lo! a railroad reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Every mile of these railroads opens up new industries, new markets, and thus the boundary of labor's possibilities widens on every hand. This is a law as inexorable as those of fate, and as true as Holy Writ; and yet, because it always has been and now is, an existing condition at variance with certain platitudes of theories considered by certain theorists to be true, they will not accept them, deny their existence, and though again and again demonstrated, persist in flying in the face of history and oftentimes repeated precedents, by insisting that if it be true that a revenue tariff did produce these results from 1833 to 1842, they could theoretically demonstrate the fact that a tariff for revenue only would not produce them from and after January, 1847, when the Walker tariff was to go into effect.

I pause long enough to remark that it did, however. Strange as it may appear to my colleagues, who clamor for a revenue tariff or a tariff for revenue only, it did work out the same identical results. In a time of profound peace, when the wants of the Government were merely nominal, and during a decade when there was taken from the mines of California and added to the circulating medium of the people the enormous sum of one thousand millions of gold, a sum sufficient in itself to awaken into life the energies of a continent; in a decade in which there were no epidemics, at a time when pestilence did not oppress, at a time when rain and sunshine brought forth abundant harvest to bless the farmer, what was our condition ten full years after the law of 1847 went into effect? Were our great labor industries busy? Was labor everywhere employed at fair wages? Did peace and prosperity bless our people? Were the receipts of the Government equal to or in excess of its current expenditures? Were the shelves of our merchants filled with the products of our looms and spindles? Did the Treasury report show a surplus? As an historical fact was the condition of the people and of the Treasury such that we can now point with pride to that period?

Mr. Chairman, this is a Democratic House that leans strongly towards free trade; a House whose Speaker is and has been since 1883 a member of the English free-trade Cobden Club; a Speaker who, in naming the Committee on Ways and Means, did not place on the majority a representative of any of these great labor industries from any one of the great manufacturing States of the Government, nor did he name the committee so that its control would be in the hands of men who have in the past and do now believe in the dignity of labor; but he did name the Committee on Ways and Means in such a way that the control of

the majority was left in the hands of men who have been and now are not only opposed to protection and in favor of free trade, but were so deeply impressed with the idea that capital should own its own labor, that they had the courage to risk life itself in an effort to create a confederacy the corner-stone of which should be human slavery.

While I am a Republican protectionist, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order that my reply may be shorn of all personality, I shall call upon a prominent and honored Democratic official to bear testimony in my behalf, a name the mere mention of which must command the respect and confidence of my colleagues upon the other side of the Chamber. A man ripe in years and in experience; a man who from childhood to a ripe old age had studied all the phases of this industrial problem and brought to his aid in reaching his conclusions all the experience of the past industrial history of the Government, and his evidence is not merely a casual remark; it is his judgment upon existing facts known to him and carefully set forth in his first annual message to Congress, delivered December 8, 1857. My witness is none other than ex-President James Buchanan, who, in speaking of the conditions—not theories—then existing in all branches of our industrial and commercial circles, said:

We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced. Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session, but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal from the statement of President Cleveland, who says the present protective tariff is the "vicious, iniquitous, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and who makes an appeal for a revenue tariff, to the experienced statesman and learned Democratic President, James Buchanan, who, in his annual message to Congress in December, 1857, laid before Congress and the country the existing conditions, not theories, of the national Treasury, the business and industrial conditions existing at the end of an uninterrupted decade of the same tariff reform, ten years of the same tariff policy that President Cleveland and the gentlemen of the South now ask us to adopt.

I ask if in the light of this Democratic official evidence, if in the light of history and in the face of these ascertained and established facts, it will be wise for Congress, with an outstanding national war debt of \$1,200,000,000 and unadjudicated debts running into the hundreds of millions, which must be paid within the next five years, to set aside an industrial policy which has been found to be equal to every emergency, in war and in peace; a policy which has quadrupled our wealth in twenty-eight years and enabled the people to pay the heavy tax burdens laid upon them and pay off seventeen hundred millions of the principal of the war debt; a policy that has built up an industrial system so diversified that it has been able to meet all the demands of our people in all their wants—I repeat, in the light of experience and history, can we afford to set aside the present policy and enter upon another and different one, one that has been often tried, and one that has just as often as it has been tried inevitably resulted in business depression, industrial paralysis, driven labor out of employment and into enforced idleness, depleted the national Treasury and left it in bankruptcy; and the national credit seriously impaired?

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that no one fact is more clearly established than this, that the inevitable result of every change in our tariff laws, from protection to a revenue tariff—or a tariff for revenue only—or in the case of every material reduction in the tariff that the trade balance has been largely increased against our Government.

The average rate of tariff in 1832 was 37.6 per cent. The same in 1833. In 1834 it was reduced to 18 per cent. The average trade balance against our Government during these three years was \$11,156,618. Then the reduced tariff of 1833 went into full effect and the average for the next three years ran down to 18, 16, and 14.5 per cent., and the average annual trade balance increased to \$30,939,540. The great financial revulsion of 1837 began in May of the latter year, and resulted in universal loss to every industry and business, while labor was everywhere in enforced idleness.

Take another financial revulsion, that of 1857. The average per cent. of the tariff for the years 1854, 1855, and 1856 was 22.7. During these years the average annual imports amounted to \$267,764,352; the exports to \$224,391,807, leaving a balance of trade against us of \$43,372,545 a year. Then the average tariff levy was reduced to 15.6 per cent., with this marvelous result: in six months our imports ran up to \$183,733,039; our exports decreased to the sum of \$105,420,659, leaving a trade balance against us in half a year of \$78,312,379, or a balance against us of more than \$156,000,000 a year; and in less than six months after the reduction took place the great financial revulsion of 1857 began, a crisis that wrought havoc and widespread disaster all over the land.

What is a balance of trade against our Government? It is the difference between what we sell abroad and what we buy from abroad, and must be paid in gold or its equivalent, and yet notwithstanding

the fact that the past history of our financial and business disasters shows conclusively the cause for each and all of them to be a radical change in our tariff laws, or a material reduction, yet we are gravely asked to-day to embark once more on the treacherous course, where we know that dangers and breakers will menace us on every hand. For one, Mr. Chairman, I shall enter my protest against such a suicidal policy, because experience, the best of all guides, tells me the result will be disastrous to the whole country, and more especially so to the labor and labor industries. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is our first, our highest, our imperative duty, to enact laws for the protection of the material interests of the people we represent. I do not believe that we can be justified, in the light of history and experience, in adopting a policy that has in every instance when it has been tested resulted in such dire results to the industrial and financial interests of the people.

PROTECTION DOES PROTECT LABOR.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber declare that protection does not protect the laborer here in America. I am not a theorist, and yet if the great industrial system of protection to American labor does not protect it I have wondered why it was that hundreds of thousands of men and women left their homes in Europe every year and emigrated to America to become citizens of the Republic and co-workers in its manifest destiny. Sir, do you believe that all these thousands come here to be made slaves? Would they flee from the oppressions of Europe to become still more oppressed here by an industrial system that is talked about, studied, and prayed for in every humble cottage in Sweden, Germany, Ireland, wherever there is a resolute heart that yearns for larger liberty, better wages, and a greater margin of profit from daily toil?

Mr. Chairman, protection does protect labor, and I am going, in a practical way, to demonstrate just how it does it in one or two lines of trade. First, I want to illustrate, by two actual purchases of clothing, one made in London, England, the other here in Washington City, and show just how the American laborer who is a tailor and works on wages paid him in comparison with the wages paid the tailor in London. I desire to state the amount paid in London for a suit of clothes and the amount paid for an overcoat; then the price paid the tailor in London for making the suit of clothes and the price paid him for making the overcoat. I desire then to show the amount the dealer retained to pay for the material used, for cutting the garments, and profit on his business in London, and having done this to institute a comparison between them and the amounts paid and received here in Washington for the same purposes.

I may be permitted to remark, Mr. Chairman, that these facts and figures, obtained from actual purchases, not from any theorist, demonstrate conclusively the truth of the declaration I now make, that protection does protect the American laborer who is a tailor and works on woolen clothing. My townsman, Dr. J. M. C. Adams, of Frankfort, Ind., was in London, England, last fall, and while there had an overcoat and suit of clothes made to order. He paid the merchant tailor in our money \$20 for the suit of clothes and \$20 for the overcoat. He asked the gentleman what he had to pay his journeyman tailor for making the suit of clothes, and he was astonished, as I have no doubt you, Mr. Chairman, the committee, and the country will be when told that the tailor who made the suit of clothes was paid the magnificent sum of \$3.50. Three dollars and fifty cents paid in the great city of London—home of the Cobden Club—for making a suit of heavy winter clothes!

Upon further inquiry he was informed that the journeyman tailor who made the overcoat was also paid the magnificent sum of \$3 for making a heavy beaver cloth overcoat. Let us for the purpose of easy comparison and illustration take \$1,000 worth of merchant tailoring in London and compare it with the same amount of work here in Washington. Let us see how much of the \$1,000 is paid in London to the men who make the clothes, and how much is retained by the dealer to pay for material used, for cutting garments, and as profits on his business; and having done that then ascertain the same facts here in Washington City, and having done this institute a comparison between them.

COST OF LONDON CLOTHING:

25 suits of clothing at \$20 each.....	\$500.00
25 overcoats at \$20 each.....	500.00

Total value of London clothing..... 1,000.00

MONEY PAID TAILORS TO MAKE LONDON CLOTHING.

Paid journeyman tailors for making 25 suits of clothes at \$3.50 each.....	\$87.50
Paid journeyman tailors for making 25 overcoats at \$3 each.....	75.00

Total amount paid for making \$1,000 worth of clothing in London 162.50

Deduct from the \$1,000 the amount paid for making the clothing, \$162.50, and we find that out of the sum the merchant tailor had left \$837.50 to pay for material, cutting, and profits. Thus we find that out of \$1,000 worth of clothing made the men who made the clothes received only \$162.50; the merchant \$837.50; or, put in another form, labor was paid 16.25 per cent. the dealer received 83.75 per cent. out of each dollar's worth of clothing sold. I bought a suit of clothes here in the city and an overcoat, and from my tailor I learned what he paid his jour for making the suit and for making the overcoat. I paid him for a spring

overcoat \$28 and he paid his journeyman tailor \$10 for making it. If it had been a heavy winter overcoat, like my townsman bought in London, then he would have paid his journeyman \$12 for making it. I paid him for the suit of clothes \$38 and he paid his journeyman tailors \$16 for making the suit.

Let us take \$1,000 worth of merchant tailoring here, or as nearly as we can, and ascertain what amount is paid for making the clothes and how much is retained by the merchant to pay for material used, for cutting the garments, and profit on the business.

COST OF WASHINGTON CLOTHING.

Sixteen overcoats at \$28 each	\$448
Fifteen suits of clothes at \$38 each	570

Total value of Washington clothing	1,018
--	-------

MONEY PAID WASHINGTON TAILORS.

Paid journeyman tailors for making sixteen overcoats at \$10 each	\$160
Paid journeyman tailors for making fifteen suits of clothes at \$16 each	240

Total amount paid for making \$1,018 worth Washington clothing	400
--	-----

Deduct from the \$1,018 worth of Washington merchant-tailor work the sum of \$400 paid Washington jour tailors for making the clothing, and we find that the merchant has left to pay for material used in the clothes, for cutting them, and profit on his business, the sum of \$618; while the merchant tailor in London has, out of the same amount, left him for the same purposes the larger sum of \$837.50. Thus out of \$1,018 worth of clothing made here in Washington, the tailors who make the clothes are paid the sum of \$400, while the merchant receives \$618; or, if you please, stated in another form, labor was paid 40 per cent.; the merchant received 60 per cent. out of each dollar's worth of clothing made and sold here in America, where, according to the arguments, declarations, and conclusions of the members of the South, labor is oppressed and impoverished by the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous policy of protection."

These facts, which are true, facts obtained from actual sales and purchases, show that here in America the tailors who make the thousand dollars' worth of clothing receive \$400 for their labor, while in London they receive only \$162.50. Four hundred dollars paid to tailors here in protected America for making \$1,000 worth of clothing *versus* \$162.50 paid for making the same amount of clothing in free-trade London tells the story of how protection protects American tailors in more convincing language than any argument I can offer, or than any words I can possibly utter. Mr. Chairman, like an axiom in mathematics, it demonstrates itself.

I make two points on the facts I have given, and I challenge contradiction of either one of them. They cannot be successfully denied. They can not be disputed. They will stand as mile-stones to mark the progress we have made in industrial development. They tell how, under the wise, practical, and beneficent system of protection, we have so diversified labor industries that the price paid for labor here is two and one half times greater than the price paid for similar work in London, England.

First. I make the point that labor here in protected America is paid 40 per cent., while in London, England, labor is paid only 16½ per cent. of the cost of clothing for making the clothes.

Second. I show that while the merchant tailor in London received 83½ per cent. of the value of the clothing he made and sold, the same person here in protected America received only 60 per cent. for the material furnished, for cutting the goods, and profit on his business.

These figures and illustrations are conclusive, and prove that labor is equally as well protected under our system of taxation as the manufacturer. Does any man pretend to think or believe, that the protected American tailor who is paid \$16 here in Washington City for making a suit of clothes can not buy more of the necessities of life here, can not live better here, can not save more money here, is not better off here, than the English tailor in London is, or can ever hope to be, who is paid and receives only \$3.50 for doing the same work in that great metropolis of free trade?

Sixteen dollars paid here in the capital of protected America for making a suit of clothes *versus* \$3.50 paid in free-trade London! Gentlemen of the South, advocates of the proposed Mills bill, a measure which should be entitled "An act to paralyze American industries and pauperize American labor for the sole benefit of foreign manufacturers, and laborers, and American importers, whose only interest in America is the rent they pay," how do you like this photograph from real life? How can these facts, and figures, and conclusions be evaded? Will any advocate of the bill under consideration stand up here, in the presence of this committee and of the country, and even pretend to say that the tailor who made my overcoat here in Washington, and was paid \$10 for the work, does not live on that sum infinitely better than the tailor in London ever can hope to live who was paid \$3 for making an overcoat there?

Ten dollars for making an overcoat here in protected America *versus* \$3 for making the same article in free-trade London carries with the statement its own conclusive answer to all the arguments that can be formulated against it, and shows in a way so plain and simple and conclusive that even a child can see and know and comprehend, and

at the same time so convincing and irresistible that human sophistry can not impair the force of the truth in the declaration that protection does protect the wages of American laborers.

AMERICAN LABORERS HAVE A SHARE OF THE WEALTH WROUGHT BY THEIR HANDS.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. BYNUM, said the other day in his able tariff speech:

The advocates of protection tell us that the country has grown rich under this system. True, it has grown rich, but where is the wealth? In the hands of the few, while poverty abides in the homes of the many. Why is it that the great masses of the people have no share in the wealth that has been wrought by their hands?

My reply to this statement is that the only true measure of prosperity is the balance the laborer has left after he has provided the necessities of life for himself and those dependent upon him; and it is by a comparison of this balance under different conditions that we can arrive at an intelligent and correct conclusion of the queries, whether the money made is in the hands of the few, and whether labor has a share of the wealth it produces here in protected America. My colleague boasts that he represents thousands of intelligent wage-workers and manufacturers of fifty millions of annual products. I admit that fact, and then I challenge him to show a community where there are an equal number of wage-workers, a city whose manufacturers produce fifty millions a year, beyond the limits of the United States, anywhere on the face of the earth, where the wage-workers own as many homes and have as much money to their credit in the banks, the savings of their labor. I tell the gentleman and the committee no man can find such a place anywhere.

I do not stop here. There are in Europe 312,000,000 people, and in the industrial North not far from 40,000,000 of people, or one-eighth the number in Europe; and yet the laborers of the North, the men who, in the opinion of my distinguished colleague, are oppressed by protection, have to-day on deposit in their savings-banks a sum equal to the savings of the wagemen of the 312,000,000 people of Europe and in addition thereto a surplus of more than \$200,000,000 to spare. Mr. Chairman, this sum, vast as it is, is not taken into consideration and does not represent a dollar's value in the millions of homes owned by the laborers of the busy industrial North. No other country on earth presents such a magnificent spectacle. No other policy than protection could enable the bread-winners in millions of instances to own their homes and in addition thereto have placed to their credit in their savings banks more than one thousand millions of dollars.

My distinguished colleague also said: "American labor to-day is carrying upon its back burdens which the labor of no other country could stand." And why, Mr. Chairman? Why can not the labor of any other country stand the burden of taxation? I will tell my colleague why. It is because they are not so well paid as American labor; not so well housed as American labor; not so well clothed as American labor; not so well fed as American labor; do not have so large a balance left after paying for the necessities of life as American labor has; and that is why they can not bear such a burden. In the great industrial North the children of our wage-workers are sent to school from six to nine months in the year; and the nearer the schools are located to one of these manufacturing centers the longer the term of school and the higher the branches of scholarship taught. I ask my colleague and the committee to name the place on earth, outside the industrial North, where the children of laborers enjoy such benefits! I pause for a reply.

I will say to gentlemen from the South that one-half nearly of the tax burdens in that section are for school purposes, and I want to remark that these public schools are the idols of our hearts.

I have for fourteen years been giving employment to labor, and believe I am familiar with its wants and demands. I have yet to hear the first objection raised by any laborer against national tariff or State taxation.

I have often heard objections raised by them against the taxes levied by city councils, township trustees, and county commissioners, and the reason is plain—the tax burden that is heavy, the tax burden that is felt, is the direct one made by municipal, township, and county tax levies. The reason I have not heard objections to the State tax is because it is light, is not felt; and the reason why no objection is made to Government tariff taxation is because it is an indirect levy, one that is not felt by the people.

My distinguished colleague will find a complete answer to the financial condition of the wagemen of Indiana in the fact that at no other period in its history have so many homes been owned by wage-workers as now; and in the further fact that at no other time have they had so much money on deposit to their credit. The amount to their credit in the savings-banks of the State is \$2,170,000, and I find by an inquiry in the district I have the honor to represent that about 40 per cent. of all the deposits in the national and private banks belongs to the wage-workers and farmers of the district. Take for illustration the First National Bank of Frankfort, Ind., just after the April payment of taxes, when deposits always run low. They have fifteen hundred depositors; of this number seven hundred are farmers and laborers. Out of a total deposit of \$230,000, \$85,000 belong to the laborers and farmers of Clifton County. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that an in-

quity in the other districts of the State would show an equal per cent. of the deposits in their banks to be the property of the wagemen and farmers that I find in the Ninth district.

I desire to call the attention of my colleague to the material prosperity of Indiana to-day as contrasted with what it was when the present tariff law was adopted; to the financial standing of the State now compared to what it was then; to the wealth of our people now as compared with their wealth then; to the financial condition of our farmers now with what it was then. I ask him to compare the comforts and conveniences of our farmers now with what they were then, their surplus money, the value of their farms, the kind of homes they live in now, the stock, herds, roads, and other evidences of thrift to be found everywhere among Indiana farmers, and contrast them with the same conditions when we adopted the protective principle in levying tariff duties, and then I challenge him to say that the policy has not been of incalculable value to Indiana farmers, laborers, mechanics, and Indiana capital, whose wealth has been increased more than \$300,000,000.

If I had time I would tell him of our dependence then upon other governments and States for all our manufactured goods, plain woollens alone excepted—not a railway-bar mill, bar-iron mill, nail-mill, plow-works, car-shop, glass-works in the State. Now Indiana has the largest wagon and carriage, plow, and plate-glass works in the country. We make railway bars of steel and ingots of steel, nails, bar-iron, railway-cars, the finest polished plate-glass, furniture, woolen goods, giving employment to scores of thousands of laborers at good wages. These consumers are brought to the doors of our farmers, who thus find a ready home market for all the products of garden, field, and farm, until Indiana has become a hive of busy industry whose people are rapidly increasing in wealth and all the accomplishments which follow in its train.

At New Albany is located the great polished plate-glass works of the late W. C. De Pauw, one of the four successful works in America. Mr. De Pauw informed me not long before his death that he lost half a million in establishing the works before a cent of profit was made up on his investment (the loss sustained by reason of the Ohio floods was not included in this amount). He also informed me that he had never made in any one year more than 5 per cent. upon the capital invested, and he told me then, as his son, N. T. De Pauw, writes me now, that they can not stand a reduction in the tariff; that if a reduction is made one of two things must occur, the works must close down or they will be forced to reduce wages. I give a table of wages paid to laborers in plate-glass works in America, England, France, Germany, and Belgium:

Statement showing the amount paid per month to workmen in plate-glass manufactories.

Department.	France, Germany, and Belgium.	England.	United States.
Casting department:			
Founders.....	\$45.00	\$50.60	\$100.00
Skimmers and teamers.....	30.00	39.20	80.00
Casters.....	18.00	27.00	40.00
Kiln-firers.....	19.00	27.00	45.00
Producer-firers.....	22.00	28.00	50.00
Grinding department:			
No. 1 grade.....	27.00	33.80	75.00
No. 2 grade.....	20.00	29.20	65.00
No. 3 grade.....	16.00	23.60	50.00
Boys.....	4.00	5.10	25.00
Smoothering department:			
No. 1 grade.....	27.00	33.80	70.00
No. 2 grade.....	20.00	29.20	60.00
No. 3 grade.....	10.00	23.60	50.00
Boys.....	4.00	6.80	18.00
Polishing department:			
No. 1 grade.....	32.00	39.20	80.00
No. 2 grade.....	25.00	31.40	60.00
Boys.....	4.00	10.80	25.00
Cutting-room:			
Chief.....	26.00	39.20	100.00
Assistants.....	24.00	33.80	75.00
Blockers.....	14.00	23.60	32.00
Packers.....	13.00	27.00	50.00
Emery-washer.....	24.00	45.00	80.00
Crocus-burner.....	24.00	33.80	75.00
Laborers.....	11.00	19.60	30.00
Bricklayers.....	39.00	39.60	100.00
Carpenters.....	37.00	39.60	65.00

The foregoing table shows almost the same increase of wages paid American glass-workers that is paid American tailors.

I want to add one illustration. In 1873 I had to buy, as trustee for another, some plate-glass. At that time American plate-glass had not been successfully made, and we were at the mercy of foreign plate-glass makers. I then paid \$260 for foreign-made glass that I can now buy for \$110, this reduction in price having been brought about by the building up of the plate-glass industries in our country and the creation of competition between home and foreign manufacturers. I will not vote to break down and close up or vote to make necessary a reduction of wages to an American industry that has in fifteen years reduced the cost to the consumer more than one-half, an industry that gives

employment directly to 6,000 American laborers at double the wages paid to foreign plate-glass makers. I would vote to build up more works and to increase wages, but I will never vote to reduce them. I desire to say further to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that, while American plate-glass makers have reduced the price to consumers more than one-half, in addition the national Treasury has been enriched in the sum of \$17,257,481.18 receipts from duty on plate-glass.

I am persuaded that every consideration demands the protection of all such American manufactures. Time forbids any further argument in this line. I know that a comparison of facts will show the same results in any one of our manufactures. Such has been the result in all cases where investigations have been made. To emphasize the condition, if possible, of wage-workers who are most directly affected by our protective system, I ask my colleague to go with me to Massachusetts, the cradle and home of protection, as it is of liberty, where American industries have been fostered for many years, and where can be found stalwart advocates of protection to American wage-men. With less population than Indiana, we find that 848,787 of her laborers and mechanics have on deposit to their credit in their savings-banks the enormous sum of \$274,098,413. If he is not yet convinced that they who produce the wealth have a share of it, I will ask him to go with me to Connecticut, land of invention and workshops. With only half the population of Indiana, 256,097 of her wage-workers have on deposit in their savings-banks the great sum of \$92,481,425. If all his doubts are not removed, I would request him to journey with me to New York, where more than 1,000,000 of her laborers—to be exact, where 1,208,072 wage-workers have placed to their credit in their savings-banks the marvelous sum of \$457,050,250. I tell my colleague here in these savings-banks are the savings of a part of those who have under our protective system created the wealth of the North by honest labor well rewarded.

To enable these truths to become indelibly impressed upon the tablets of his memory, I invite him to examine the statistics of the nine great manufacturing States, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, where 2,944,731 wage-workers have on deposit in their savings-banks \$1,033,279,827, a sum almost equal to the national debt. What more evidence can be wanted? What more conclusive answer to the query of my colleague can be made? What clearer refutation of the charge that protection impoverishes labor is possible? I say to my colleague, Mr. BYNUM, my dear sir, you are mistaken in your query, "Why is it that the great mass of the people have no share in the wealth that has been wrought by their hands?" They do have. The great number of 2,944,731 of them, in nine States, have placed to their credit the enormous sum \$1,033,279,827 of the wealth that was wrought by their hands, and these people are the wage-workers under the protective system your President has seen proper to style the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous source of taxation;" and as I read the history of the past twenty-seven years of my country, note its marvelous growth in wealth, see how the cost to the consumer has been reduced one-half by reason of the competition fostered and built up under our wise industrial policy, whereby protection to American labor and American industries has been the central idea, and when I try to comprehend the quantity of the savings of those directly benefited in only nine States, over \$1,000,000,000 earned—ay, earned and saved under that system of protection President Cleveland styles "vicious, illogical, iniquitous"—I am reminded of the expression of a Hoosier who, as he in his ignorance imagined, had been converted, and who, when called upon soon thereafter to pray in public, had the audacity to begin his prayer by exclaiming, "Oh, thou logical, rogical, diabolical God!"

I place the famous expression of President Cleveland, who in an official message to this House, in speaking of the protective features of our tariff laws, a system which has, as it has been clearly shown, in twenty-seven years quadrupled our wealth, made America the greatest manufacturing nation on earth, enabled our wage-workers to place on deposit out of their savings a sum \$200,000,000 larger than all the combined savings of laborers in Europe; a system which has brought our national currency to par and made our national credit the best of any Government on earth; a system that has provided money to defray the current expenses of Government, and pay off seventeen hundred millions of the principal of the war debt; a system which has reduced the cost to consumers one-half, and enables American wagemen to be paid the highest wages on earth; a system that has done all these things and left a large surplus in the Treasury—I repeat, I place President Cleveland's famous expression in reference to this system, which he styles the "vicious, illogical, iniquitous source of unnecessary taxation," alongside the one where the tyro in religion prayed to God as the "logical, rogical, diabolical God," and I present them, Mr. Chairman, as companion pieces of ignorance of the plainest fundamental principles of the subjects under consideration when they were uttered.

DEMOCRACY OPPOSED TO PROTECTION.

My distinguished friend, Mr. MCCOMAS, of Maryland, in his speech of May 2, in speaking of the bill now pending, said:

Has any friend of this bill in this debate uttered one sentence in favor of the American tariff system, which discriminates in favor of the home producer and laborer?

He paused and yielded time for a reply, whereupon the eloquent member from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] replied. I quote from the RECORD of May 3:

MR. HOOKER. No. There was no one, and you will not hear any Democrat utter one.

That statement will not be forgotten. I want to publicly thank the distinguished gentleman for that frank, clear, honest, and conclusive statement:

No. There was no one, and you will not hear any Democrat utter one.

It is refreshing after years of doubt to know from so high an authority that no Democrat here upon this floor will utter a word in favor of the American tariff system, which has wrought such marvelous development for American industries. I read the words, Mr. Chairman, and then I thought that the distinguished Democratic leader from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and his colleagues were Democrats. Mr. RANDALL has been in Congress for a quarter of a century, has won honorable party leadership along the line of this industrial problem. I have yet to hear of his ever being accused of writing, speaking, working, or voting for any other than the Democratic party and all of its candidates, and I submit if twenty-five years of continuous public service for the Democratic party can be so easily and summarily dispensed with. I say to the gentlemen of the South that Mr. Cleveland owes his election to Mr. RANDALL's influence in New York and New Jersey.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. HOOKER, voiced not only his own sentiments, but also those of his people when he uttered the words I have quoted. The people of his section, I regret to say, since 1832, when they became thoroughly imbued with the pernicious doctrines of the great leader in South Carolina, Mr. Calhoun, have not deemed it wise or proper to support legislation in Congress which would tend to establish an American system of industrial development, that would protect American interests and foster and build up American industries; and yet, Mr. Chairman, I have asked myself this question, What interests can possibly lie nearer the hearts of my distinguished friend, Mr. HOOKER, and those of his constituents, than the interests of the American people? We are all Americans—the people of Maine and those of Texas, the people of Mississippi and those of Indiana—and I must, as an American, feel a just pride in any policy which brings blessings and plenty to any section of my country.

I concede the fact that the leaders of the South since 1832 have fought the principle of protection and the American industrial policy; fought it persistently, bravely, openly; upon the forum, in this Hall, at the ballot-box, and upon hundreds of battle-fields. The great war of the rebellion was brought about for the sole purpose of creating a government whose fundamental principles should be human slavery and free trade. The constitution of the so-called Confederate States provided among other things that its congress should be clothed with the authority—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury; nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.

That is free trade, pure and simple.

Before the war the institution of slavery, which existed only in the South, demanded as its companion-piece in their industrial system free trade. They were complements of each other, and I can readily see and understand why before the war and so long as the people of the South had slavery they should favor free trade and oppose the principle of protection, because the latter would be antagonistic to the institution of slavery. The war has changed all these conditions. A new era has dawned upon our country, the cause for sectionalism has been removed, and there is no longer any reason in theory or in fact, why the people of one section of the Union shall oppose a principle which the history of the past and our own experience teaches us has benefited all classes in every community where it has been adopted. I point my colleagues of the South to the cotton and iron manufactures which, under the present protective system, have been established in Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama, and ask them if their coming has not largely increased the value of real estate and benefited the farmers and laborers of that section.

I invite the gentlemen to go with me among the workmen in the industrial centers of the North, ascertain the number of the homes they own—millions of homes earned and paid for out of the savings of their daily toil. Let us examine their savings of money on deposit in the laborers' banks, the savings-banks of that section—in round numbers three millions of depositors, with more than a thousand millions of dollars to their credit. Let us visit their homes, their schools, their reading rooms, their societies, where we shall find many evidences of plenty, contentment, and even the luxuries of life; and then when we have done this I ask my colleagues of the South to contrast the condition of these wagemen, their homes, schools, savings, and general surroundings and intelligence, with those of the South, of England, or anywhere else on earth, and then they will see and know why the Republican party, representative of the great loyal, liberty-loving, and American-imbued North, accepted the wager of battle tendered them in 1861 and fought to a successful conclusion the war to preserve the nationality

of the Union. The great loyal heart of the North believed that labor should be made a king, not a slave.

They believed that freedom was the birth-right and heritage of every American citizen; and that every citizen was entitled to the amplest protection in life, liberty, and business. So thoroughly imbued are the Republicans with this theory of equal rights and protection that I challenge my colleagues upon the other side of the Chamber to name one Republican voting precinct in any State from Maine to Oregon where there is not absolute protection of the sacred right of the ballot. There can not be found one Republican voting precinct anywhere where the humblest citizen, native or foreign born, black or white, who is a legal voter, can not go openly and freely as becomes a freeman, and vote for the men of his choice, have his vote counted as it was cast, and the result honestly announced. So deeply and thoroughly are Republicans imbued with this doctrine of protection for all in all their rights of citizenship that the man who would oppose it would be as one in fifty thousand.

The Republican masses and the great industrial North are in favor of equal rights and protection; protection of national unity; protection of the equality of citizenship whereby one vote in Indiana shall equal one vote from any other State in this House and in the councils of the nation; protection of American manufactures and laborers by a wisely devised protective-tariff system. "Ah, my dear sir," says one of my colleagues of the South, "Do you not know that your protective system is a giant robber?" My reply is, "My dear sir, I can not comprehend your meaning when you call protection a robber. I look into the national Treasury and see that it brings into it the money required by the wants of the Government? I talk with the men who have their money invested in American industries, and they tell me, 'We do not want a change.' I go among the great mass of the people—those who buy and consume the products of these protected industries—and they tell me, 'We now buy our articles at one-half the price we paid before we built up these industries and made them ourselves; we are not robbed at all.' I then seek an interview with the bread-winners, the men who toil; we talk over the whole situation and contrast conditions under different systems; some of them have fled from the oppressions of free trade and know from experience, the best of all teachers, the 'God's truth about the whole business.' They tell me, 'We own more homes, have more money saved, receive better wages, than any other bread-winners on earth. The system does not rob us, and we ask you to let well enough alone.' Upon inquiry I learn that our national wealth has increased 400 per cent. in twenty-eight years of this robbery, four of those years being a period of cruel, devastating war, and I wonder who has been robbed. Surely not America, nor her people, for they have grown rich beyond comparison with any other people on earth during the same time."

Mr. Chairman, protection is not robbery. It is a blessing both to the Government and the people. It has been a blessing to the United States of America since 1861, when the present policy went into operation. There comes to me, Mr. Chairman, a voice from out of the experience of the past which says to me that it is the highest duty of the legislator in this Government of the people to enact laws whereby the people shall be fully protected in all their rights; hence I am in favor of protecting the unity of the nation, protecting the purity and equality of the ballot, protecting the honor of my country, protecting American industries, and protecting American labor from being forced to accept the cheaper wages paid to free-trade European bread-winners.

DEMOCRACY AND MONOPOLY.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], in speaking of tariff reform and Democracy, April 30, said "I want it to be of that kind that can point to Mount Vernon's shades and Monticello's heights and say that from the day of its birth it has been the mortal enemy of monopoly." And as I read I wondered, Mr. Chairman, if it could be possible that my eloquent colleague had forgotten the history of this generation. The head and heart and soul of Democracy have not been, nor are they now, the "mortal enemy of monopoly" from its birth. Upon the contrary, not content with advocating the claims of the giant monopoly of the century—human slavery—within the jurisdiction of the Government, they actually endeavored to withdraw from the Union and organize a confederacy, the chief corner-stone of which was to be the giant monopoly, human slavery. The Democratic party of to-day is the open ally, the avowed champion, the chief support of the greatest monopoly of this age, the whisky league, a monopoly that is not content with controlling the whisky business, but assumes to dictate political policies, control party management, and corrupt elections by bribing electors and election officers, and Old Sumptuary will once more be called into service at St. Louis in June to sound the key-note of the new alliance of 1888, entered into between the Democratic party and the Whisky League of America.

I desire to remind my distinguished friend of another fact which shows how the souls of Democratic leaders yearn for a chance to become the "mortal enemy of monopoly." I refer him and the committee to the metal schedule in the bill under consideration, and to the item of steel railway bars. Under existing laws the tariff is \$17 a ton. It is proposed to reduce the tariff on railway bars to \$11 a ton, a

reduction of \$6 a ton, or a fraction over 35 per cent.; and for whose benefit? For the sole benefit of the railroad monopolists of America. I concede that the majority report tries to theorize and show that if the tariff is reduced the cost of building railroads will be cheapened, and then freights and fare will also be cheapened. I say, however, and I appeal to the history and experience of the past to prove the truth of the saying, that the rates of fare and freight are not in any way whatever affected by the tariff on railway bars, but are agreed upon and adjusted in advance, at least annually, by the great trunk lines, when they meet to make assignments of per cents. of traffic to competing lines. And yet so intense and burning is the desire of the Democratic party to become the "mortal enemy of monopoly" that it would reduce the tariff on railway bars \$6 a ton, thereby seriously crippling the rail-mills of the country, with all the scores of millions of invested capital, and largely reduce the wages of all the thousands of workmen in these mills; and for whose benefit? For the sole benefit of the railway monopolists of America and the rail-makers of Europe; while by the provisions of the pending bill it is proposed to levy and collect \$45,000,000 a year from sugar, a prime necessity of life.

Mr. Chairman, just imagine the force of the declaration of Democracy's "mortal hatred of monopoly" in the bill under consideration, wherein Democracy makes a reduction of 35 per cent. in favor of railway monopolists and only 20 per cent. on sugar, a prime necessity of life. The majority report of the bill under consideration places the total value of all manufactured products in America last year at \$7,000,000,000. The amount of wages paid to American laborers to make these products was \$1,400,000,000. The sum of money that would have been paid in Germany to labor to make the same products would have been \$816,000,000, and in England English laborers would have been paid \$784,000,000. The total amount of tariff collected last year was \$217,286,893, therefore I say to the gentleman that the difference paid to the workmen here in America above the wages paid either in Germany or England is nearly equal to three times the total sum of tariff taxes levied and collected.

TABLE OF PRODUCTS, LABOR AND TARIFF.

Amount of manufactures.....	\$7,000,000,000
Wages paid to make them in America.....	1,400,000,000
Wages paid to make them in Germany.....	816,000,000
Excess of wages paid in America.....	784,000,000
Wages paid to make them in America.....	1,400,000,000
Wages paid to make them in England.....	784,000,000
Excess of wages paid in America.....	616,000,000
Let us charge the whole tariff levy to labor and see how the balance will stand:	
American pay-roll in excess of pay-roll in Germany.....	\$784,000,000
Deduct total amount of tariff.....	217,286,893
Balance to credit of American wages.....	566,713,107
American pay-roll in excess of pay-roll in England.....	616,000,000
Deduct total tariff duties.....	217,286,893
Balance to credit of American wages.....	398,713,107

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished, that with full knowledge of the very great difference paid in wages here and in Europe, that gentlemen will seriously insist that the way to reduce the revenue of the Government is to reduce the rate of duty. If the Mills bill shall become a law without amendment I predict that, instead of reducing, it will double our revenues, close down the greater part of our manufacturing industries, and place our laborers in enforced idleness.

I call the attention of the committee to the history of increased imports in 1835 and in 1857, immediately after material changes in our tariff laws, and to the very large excess of wages paid in America above those paid in Germany and in England to manufacture the products of last year, as the reasons why this result will surely follow until the accumulated wealth of our workmen, an amount over one thousand millions, shall become exhausted. There is only one practical way to reduce the revenues of the Government, and that is to increase the freelist and also increase the rate of duty levied upon importations, and thereby decrease the quantity of importations upon which duties are levied. The adoption of such a policy would surely reduce the revenues of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, there is another monopoly in existence in this country; a monopoly that is inimical to the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people. This monopoly is an active, aggressive factor; it will not tolerate opposition, and is so constituted that its charter may become perpetual. It is insolent in its demands, imperial in its methods, un-American in its tendencies, and yet, strange as it may appear, Democracy is not the "mortal enemy" of this monopoly.

Democracy loves political power. The monopoly I refer to exercises autocratic political power in the name of the solid South. The Democratic party, through this monopoly—the solid South—arrogates to itself the right to count and claim all the votes of that section. It will not tolerate opposition to its purposes. It has demonstrated a new problem—that a unanimous vote can be greater than the vote cast.

Democracy may not be united upon other questions, but it is upon its monopoly of the right to receive votes in the South. I have heard it said, and believe the saying to be true, that if there is any one idol that is more precious than all others to Democracy, any one central idea around which the head and body, the heart and soul of Democracy love to rally, as its chosen leaders ponder over and fully contemplate the length and breadth, the height and depth of Democracy's "mortal hatred of monopoly," it is its darling pet—the solid South. The alliance between them is both offensive and defensive. How disconsolate indeed would modern Democracy be without its monopoly of the solid South. To contemplate Democracy without the solid South could only be equalled by an effort to contemplate the play of Rip Van Winkle with the character of Old Rip left out. When the days of this monopoly are ended, the mission of Democracy will be completed. Democracy can not exist without its monopoly of the solid South. They are one and inseparable, as much so, Mr. Chairman, as were the famous Siamese twins of that section.

A MATERIAL REDUCTION OF REVENUE MEANS OPPOSITION TO PENSIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of any material reduction of the revenues of the Government. No greater mistake could be made by Congress than to largely decrease the revenues at this time. The funded debt of the Government is over \$1,200,000,000, two hundred millions and more of which fall due inside of five years. The current expenses of Government exceed three hundred millions a year. There is a great outstanding debt not yet adjudicated, which will run up into hundreds of millions of dollars, claims pending for half a century. Besides all these there are now pending in the Pension Department in this city one hundred thousand claims of Union soldiers and their loved ones; claims for pension which ought to be allowed; claims that are as legal, just, and binding as claims can be; claims that can not be allowed under existing laws, because of technical failure of proof. The Government owes these heroes a sacred debt, and it should by a general law enable these claims to be allowed. To meet all these solemn obligations will require sixty millions or more and thereafter largely increase the annual pension-list. We can not enact a law which will secure so large a measure of justice to the people as one which shall provide for these claimants. We should by a general law provide for every Union soldier who is now broken in health, and for all the widows and children of deceased Union soldiers.

The Government very wisely pensioned all the Mexican war veterans at the age of sixty-two. I say, sir, and with all due respect to those veteran heroes, that great and honorable as their services were, they become dwarfed into insignificance when compared with the services rendered the Government by the Union soldiers. The Union soldiers won the greatest victory of all the ages in behalf of humanity. They saved the United States to the arts of peace and industrial development. They preserved the unity of the nation and rescued our flag from destruction and made it the proud emblem of a government of the people, whose chief glory is that the people are equal before the law. The Union soldiers saved this temple of human hopes and of liberty protected by law to bless all the countless millions who shall occupy it.

Who can measure the obligation we owe these Union soldiers? They risked life for country and humanity. What more could they do? What better evidence of consecrated devotion could be presented? Having done so much for the Government, I now demand that in the hour of the nation's prosperity, when its Treasury groans beneath its weight of silver and gold, when all the current obligations are met and there still remains a surplus, that the Government these heroes saved shall properly care for all of them and their widows and children. Care for them as a Government of the people should care for its citizen soldiers who in the hour of its greatest peril risked life in its behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I can not speak for other members; I cannot know into what lines of thought and action duty may call them. I do know this, however, that, on behalf of the million surviving comrades of the Union Army, the men to whom we are indebted for all the blessings of constitutional liberty and a Government of the people, I shall oppose any and all material reductions of the revenues of the Government until all its solemn obligations to all these Union soldiers, for pay, bounty, and pensions, shall have been fully paid. I shall insist that the promises made these soldiers shall be sacredly kept by the Government; every promise to every soldier, and to his widow and his children. The surplus is theirs. It belongs of right to the men who saved not only the surplus, but the Government itself, from total destruction.

Again, Mr. Chairman, one of the results of the late war was the enfranchisement of the colored race—a race that had been held in legal bondage under the laws of the land. Other laws made the act of teaching them to read and think for themselves a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment. The law not only held them in slavery, it also kept them in ignorance. The war has changed their legal status; then they were slaves; now they are citizens, equal before the law with their more highly favored brothers of Saxon origin, and every consideration of national honor and safety demands that this race be educated and through it be made capable of exercising intelligently the rights and duties of citizenship, intelligence being one of the greatest safeguards of the state. The presence of slavery in the South made

ignorance the birthright and heritage of all the poor white people of that section, and to them education should be sent. I hold, Mr. Chairman—and it is the judgment of the people I have the honor to represent as well as my own—that, under these circumstances, the line of duty is very plain for the Government to pursue. The least it can do, the least it ought to do, is to take out of its overflowing Treasury not less than \$12,000,000 a year, and expend it in organizing and aiding the public schools in the South. The Government made the slaves citizens; it should qualify them for citizenship and then let them alone to work out as a race their own destiny.

There is no justice in or need of the direct tax on cigar-dealers and druggists. These should be removed. This would decrease the revenue three millions. No man can justify the levying of a revenue tax on alcohol used in the arts. This tax should be removed. There are known safeguards which will prevent the alcohol used for that purpose from ever being used as a beverage. This would reduce the revenue not less than eight millions. More than 25 per cent. of the tariff revenue of 1887 was paid on sugar—a prime necessity; an article that enters into use in every home, whether it be the cottage of the laborer or the palace of the millionaire. It is not a protective tariff beyond the sum of six millions of dollars, because of the fact that we do not produce over one-tenth the sugar we consume. Of the vast sum of fifty-eight millions of duty derived from the tariff on sugar, it therefore follows that six millions operates as a protection to American sugar, and the enormous sum of fifty-two millions of the sugar tariff was a tariff for revenue, pure and simple, and that levied on a prime necessity of life.

The bill under consideration proposes to raise the great sum of forty-five millions a year of tariff revenue from sugar, a necessity in every American home, and I shall enter my protest against such a burden being laid on sugar. It is not a tariff levied with a view of protecting American sugar beyond the sum of \$6,000,000, but will, if adopted, make sugar bear a direct revenue tariff of \$39,000,000 a year. The Government can pay a direct bounty on every pound of sugar produced in America for a period of nine years, levy a tariff on imported sugar to pay the bounty to American sugar, and if under the stimulus of a direct bounty the amount produced shall increase from one-tenth to one-half the quantity our people consume, they will save in nine years time, by the adoption of the bounty system and the repeal of the present unjust and outrageous sugar tariff, the sum of at least \$220,000,000. No man can be a consistent protectionist and advocate and favor the levying of a tariff on sugar, which will bring into the Treasury forty-five million a year—a sum of money which is and must be a revenue tariff pure and simple, and that too collected upon a necessity in every home.

USE THE SURPLUS TO RESTORE SILVER TO PAR.

When our fathers adopted the standard of values for our Government upon which should be based the financial transactions of Government and people, they said silver and gold shall be the standards, and they adopted a ratio between these precious metals. Their action was eminently wise, conservative, just. From the day, long centuries ago, when for thirty pieces of silver a burial place was purchased, to this hour, silver has changed less in intrinsic value than gold. The same fact holds good in the history of our own country. Certain holders of bonded securities have for years been actively engaged in an effort to have the leading governments of earth adopt a single-coin standard, and that to be gold. No friend of humanity, no friend of this Government of the people, can advocate that measure. No more pernicious legislation can be conceived than an act to reduce the standard of values one-half by demonetizing one of the two precious metals. Its effect would be to double the wealth of every creditor and double the debt of every debtor, thus creating an impassable barrier between poverty and wealth. America is a coin-producing country, large quantities of both silver and gold being produced each year; hence it follows that the Government should, by every known legal enactment, and by every recognized diplomatic policy known, exert its great influence in favor of keeping and maintaining both standards at par. At this time, and for a few years past, the bullion value of our silver dollar has been, and is, worth less in the money markets than the bullion value of gold. What have we done to restore the equilibrium of values? Nothing, absolutely nothing. What are we doing to-day? Nothing whatever.

We produce about fifty millions of silver a year. All our national debt and private debts are based on it as one of the two equal standards, and yet when there is a deliberate effort made to demonetize silver, and thus destroy its value as a standard of other values, with the national Treasury overflowing we sit idly by and do absolutely nothing to arrest the depreciation of silver. Under existing law the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase and coin two millions of silver every month. If the Government would go upon the markets and purchase double that sum, buy four millions a month, in less than two years' time silver would be equal to its former value, and once more equal to gold. The Government has made \$30,000,000 out of the coinage of silver, therefore the Government can well afford to make an investment in silver, the inevitable result of which will be to pull the whole mass of silver up to par with gold in all the nations of earth. The Government owes this effort to place the metals at par on the old ratio to the people and business interests, not only of our Government, but the world.

Mr. Chairman, it may be wise statesmanship to take 125 or 126 cents of the people's money and go upon the markets and buy with it 100 cents of the people's paper. I repeat, it may be wise, businesslike, and economic statesmanship to do that thing if it be, I am not able to see it in that light. I can not believe it is a wise policy to do that; yet the Secretary of the Treasury is doing that very thing. Recently, when the bill was under consideration to increase the circulation of national banks from 90 to 100 per cent. of the face value of the bonds deposited to secure the circulation, I was amused as I contemplated the anomaly of Congress trying by the enactment of one law to increase the value of the outstanding Government bonds, while by another bill then pending it proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to go upon the market and buy the very same bonds out of the surplus in the people's Treasury. I would, if I could, authorize the Secretary to go upon the market and buy silver with the surplus. If bondholders in Europe and America continued their efforts to depreciate silver, I would let them know that Uncle Sam was the backer of silver to the amount that he had decided that the law which has been in existence for nearly a century, which said that 412½ grains of 900 fine silver, stamped with the sovereignty of the United States as being a dollar, was a dollar, and should be so received and accepted everywhere; and when this is done it will be because it is known that Uncle Sam's resources are beyond computation.

Doubting Thomases predicted in 1861 that the Union would be destroyed. Uncle Sam said it should not be. The Union exists, and is one and inseparable. Then these same people declared that the war debt could never, no, never be paid. Uncle Sam very quietly and yet firmly declared it shall be paid, every dollar of it, and I will show you how to enable the people to pay it and at the same time enrich themselves; and then he started up an American industrial system that has been and is the marvel of the ages, and, lo and behold, how rapidly that debt disappears. Every dollar that is due is paid, and a great surplus balance in the Treasury.

Whenever Uncle Sam shall lay his hand on the silver problem and say it shall be taken and accepted as an equal standard of values with gold, according to the law fixing the ratio adopted by our fathers, it will be so accepted, because the resources of Uncle Sam are illimitable. Silver is distinctively the people's money. Uncle Sam is the representative of the people's Government. He should utilize the surplus in his Treasury in buying silver and restoring it to par with gold. It is his coin. Silver should be Americanized fully and completely, like our industrial policy, and when this is done it will be at par. When we authorize the purchase of silver instead of bonds out of the surplus in the Treasury we shall confer a lasting blessing on this generation by a restoration of the equality of values, and by inaugurating an era of unprecedented prosperity in all the avenues of business, and thereby confer a blessing upon all the sons and daughters of toil.

Mr. PLUMB Mr. Chairman, the question before the committee, which has been so long and so ably discussed, is, under the present state of public affairs, a broad one. It reaches far beyond any paltry cent per cent. view of rates of duties to be demanded on this or that importation; it comprises within its ample outline the surplus in the Treasury, debt payment, internal-revenue taxation, a proper economic system for the country, and thus affects the prosperity and happiness of every citizen of the United States.

The settlement of this question involves the supremacy, if not the very existence, of the political parties of the day, and with them the different policies they propose to pursue in administering the affairs of the Government. It, moreover, goes to the very bottom of the social condition of the various sections of the Union, both as to what these conditions now are and what they are to be.

Taken with our system of money, with which it is intimately connected, it is by far the most important that in time of peace interests and affects the American people. In what I may say upon this occasion I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the principal provisions of the Mills bill so called. Others who have addressed the House on both sides of this Chamber have given special attention to the details of this measure, and it has been shown that whatever is its purpose, it is an ill-advised and unsatisfactory bill, which if enacted into law, would deal a death-blow to our system of protection.

It is with such a view that I shall offer to the committee the ideas I entertain on this great question. In so doing I shall speak plainly, especially of such public men as are actors in the important events now transpiring, not for the purpose of traducing them personally, but in the exercise of the privilege of a member on this floor to criticize every public officer for his official acts.

I shall refer to the surplus in the Treasury and the course pursued by the President in relation to it, as well as his determined purpose to overthrow protection. I shall refer to the course of the Speaker or the House in the appointment of the Ways and Means Committee and of the fitness of that committee to discharge the duties thereof, and shall endeavor to show that ever since this Administration came into power a plan has existed which has at length ripened into a conspiracy to cause the Democratic party to entirely change front, both on the question of protection and of taxation by means of internal revenue.

SURPLUS.

When President Cleveland was inaugurated there were less than

\$10,000,000 in the public Treasury applicable to the payment of the public debt, the administrations that preceded him having pursued faithfully the Republican policy of using the surplus to pay the debt and stop interest. But not so Mr. Cleveland; although there were subject to call enough 3 per cent. bonds to absorb the accumulations in the Treasury, some nine months were suffered to pass and nearly a hundred millions had accumulated before the Treasury began to call for these bonds.

The evils of such financial management were clearly understood by the President, for in his message he says:

The public Treasury, which should only exist as a conduit conveying the people's tribute to its legitimate objects of expenditure, becomes a hoarding-place for money needlessly withdrawn from trade and the people's use, thus crippling our national energies, suspending our country's development, preventing investment in productive enterprise, threatening financial disturbance, and inviting schemes of public plunder.

And, what is more, this Administration came into power demanding that the surplus be used for paying the public debt; and yet this same Administration, guided by this same President, inaugurated a financial policy which violated not only every doctrine laid down in his message, but a prominent plank in the platform of his party, and he has continued to do so to this very hour.

Mr. Chairman, there is not now, nor has there been since December 1, 1873, any legal necessity for ceasing to pay off the public debt, and no Republican administration has faltered in the work of debt payment. The law as it stands in the statute-books, and as it stood before and since any of the 4½ and 4 per cent. bonds were issued, provides for the redemption and payment of the public debt whenever conditions exist such as have prevailed ever since this Administration came into power.

Sir, I deny emphatically that there is a dollar of surplus in the Treasury.

How is it possible to have a surplus when the Government debt exceeds one thousand millions of dollars, nearly all of which sum is represented by bonds that were issued under a statute which reserves to the Government the right to redeem them before maturity under certain prescribed conditions which now exist? Would any business man or banker dare to report a surplus in a statement of his private affairs under similar circumstances?

If General Andrew Jackson was now in the Presidential chair, does any one think he would be paying a premium to bondholders? No, sir; far from it. It is left to this Administration to put its hands into the Treasury and pay in premiums millions of dollars, when the law clearly points to a payment of the principal and interest of the debt with no premium added, and for one I can not resist the conclusion that had he been as true to the people in this matter as he has ever been to the hoarder of capital he would not have asked for Congressional sanction as a shield and excuse for not relieving the tax-payers of the country from the payment of premiums for the sole benefit of a small but powerful class of bondholders.

But, Mr. Chairman, this financial jugglery had another object, which was to obtain Congressional assent to the avowal made in his message that—

In considering the question of purchasing bonds as a means of restoring to circulation the surplus money in the Treasury it should be borne in mind that premiums must of course be paid upon such purchases, and that a large part of these bonds could not be purchased at any price—

a proposition which contemplated that the bonds would become too dear to purchase, which would justify an attack on the principles of protection to American industries as the only means left for the reduction of the surplus.

It is pertinent to ask here, Mr. Chairman, why the House of Representatives, with a Democratic majority of 41 in the Forty-ninth Congress, did not pass a measure which would have effectually provided against the surplus then in the Treasury—the surplus complained of by the President, and for which the Speaker, on taking the chair, urged Congress for a speedy enactment of some substantial measure of relief. It was in the power of the Speaker to have constituted the Ways and Means Committee without changing the number of good and true Democrats on it, so that a measure would have been reported from it and passed the House which would have corrected the inequalities of the tariff and reduced taxation without attacking or endangering protection to labor, so essential to the prosperity of all our people.

Mr. Chairman, it was the earnest desire of the constituents of a large majority of gentlemen then on this floor to have had this done, and but for the power exercised for its defeat by the Speaker, it would have been done then. Sir, the gentleman from Kentucky, who presides over our deliberations, receives and is entitled to the confidence and respect of this body, regardless of party, for the able and impartial manner in which he discharges his duty as a parliamentarian; but, sir, as impartial as he may be in deciding questions of order, it can not be denied that he and he alone is accountable for the existence of the surplus in the Treasury. Sir, if there be in the history of financial legislation a more flagrant exercise of political power than this, I know not where it is to be found. But, sir, this is not all. The committee appointed by the Speaker again and again refused to permit the ma-

jority of the House to vote upon such effective measures for disposing of the surplus as to them seemed best.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly plain that all that was thus done to retain the surplus in the Treasury was in pursuance of a well matured plan and for a well understood purpose, which was nothing less than to furnish an excuse for an attack upon protection—a plan which was as fully entertained by the President as by the Speaker. If any doubt exists as to this, the remarkable message of the President will at once dispel that doubt. On the question of the surplus he has spoken with all the solemnity of a state paper. He has deemed his dictum on this subject to be of so much importance as to justify himself in an absolute refusal to follow the direction given in the Constitution, as understood and followed by every one of his predecessors from Washington to Arthur. That instrument says:

The President shall from time to time give the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

This is his plain duty, "but whatsoever is more than this cometh of evil." The President has informed Congress as to the condition of the Treasury, and no one has a right to criticize the language employed for that purpose; but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when the Chief Magistrate goes further than to give information, and not only recommends for our consideration measures, but passes judgment in advance on the different methods by which the end desired may be reached, commanding as he does one method of taxation and condemning another as vicious, both being constitutional, and each having been adopted by the Government ever since it had an existence, that high functionary betrays either a lack of regard for the requirements of the Constitution or an unwarranted desire to dictate to a co-ordinate branch of the Government what legislation it must adopt.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

I have already pointed to the President's stubborn refusal to dispose of the surplus and have not shown the subterfuges which have been resorted to in order not to do the very thing he was clothed with power to accomplish, and I next call attention to the new position he has taken on the subject of internal-revenue taxes, and which, at his instigation, the Democratic party is expected to take on that question.

The Democratic platform of 1884 declares that—

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-houses have been the chief source of Federal revenue, and such they must continue to be. The internal revenue is a war tax. We denounce the Republican party for having failed to relieve the people of crushing war taxes.

Every one of the above declarations was Democratic gospel when Mr. Cleveland was nominated as the standard-bearer of the party, and to these propositions there was no dissent. It has been the boast of Democracy that its principles never change. They were time-honored and immutable; but alas! for these degenerate days, this cry can no longer suffice to give confidence and comfort to the hearts of the Bourbons. Their new President has for some reason made a new platform covering the issue I have quoted, and his chosen Secretary of the Treasury uses his influence to aid in foisting a new and different doctrine of finance on the party and on the country from that of 1884. The President insists that internal revenue shall remain as a part of our system of taxation, and the Secretary of the Treasury, after conceding that internal taxation is a war measure, says that it should not be done away with, but should be installed as a permanent part of our system.

Why this right about face, Mr. Chairman, and from whence comes the authority of a jumbo of Democratic leaders to commit the lesser lights of the party to such a new departure? Surely something occult must account for this radical change of front, and to bring this hidden something to light will be my endeavor.

Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, the President well knew that no important changes in our protective system would be tolerated as long as surplus was employed in reducing the public debt, nor as long as the expressed sentiment of all parties in favor of dispensing with internal-revenue taxes known as war taxes remained unchanged. We have seen in what manner he has maneuvered with debt reduction and the surplus, and we now see with what deliberation he repudiates the Democratic platform in regard to the removal of the internal-revenue or war tax, both being necessary in order to have an excuse to attack protection. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the President has protested over and over again that such is not the object, but "he doth protest too much" with his words. Let the argument of his message speak on this point.

The President states that the sum of one hundred and thirteen millions will be on hand as a surplus in the Treasury on the 30th of June next, the close of the fiscal year, and this sum he claims measures the excess of taxation which he insists must be reduced by that amount; and he further declares against any reduction in internal revenue which now amounts to one hundred and twenty millions per annum. So when one figures out these propositions they find them to mean that one hundred and thirteen millions should be taken from revenues now collected annually from customs. These collections for the last fiscal year amounted to \$217,000,000; now, if you follow the President's figures and reduce this sum by one hundred and thirteen millions, which

ought not, as he insists, to be levied, there would remain only one hundred and four millions to be collected annually as duties on imported goods, a reduction of nearly 50 per cent. on the present amount.

These estimates and these propositions are of the President's own making, and they show to what extent he proposes to reduce the tariff. I know, Mr. Chairman, that none of the President's supporters on this floor dare adopt his bold utterances on the amount of reduction to be insisted upon, for they well understand that it would be impolitic to do so now, but there the figures stand, and they show how thoroughly the President is committed to the destruction of protection, for who can not see that it would be impossible to reduce the tariff 50 per cent. without bringing absolute destruction upon every important manufacturing industry in the land.

So, instead of striking the full blow at once, as the proposals of the message clearly indicate, the Mills bill is brought forward; not as a full expression of the free-trade idea now, but as one more possible to adopt and just as sure to accomplish that destruction in the end.

Mr. Chairman, the *personnel* of the Ways and Means Committee of the present Congress shows unmistakably that the interests of the majority of the people was not considered in its formation. I have no wish or desire by thought or word to in the least disparage any of the gentlemen composing that committee. They are not to be blamed for accepting the high position assigned to them by the Speaker. They each and all of them have ability and attainments which entitle them to the respect of those who know them, but they are not in sympathy with the people of this country on the economic questions committed to their charge. This is not strange, as will appear when we consider their antecedents and surroundings.

The committee consists nominally of thirteen members, five of whom are Republicans and eight Democrats, but six of the latter came from States recently under the thralldom of slavery, namely, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Georgia, and West Virginia—these States thus furnishing six-eighths of this important committee; and I say this advisedly, for while there are nominally five Republican members, the bill comes solely from the eight Democratic members, not one of the Republicans having been permitted to see the bill or even to know a single syllable it was to contain until it had been published to the country. Every Republican on that committee might as well have been at their homes as dancing attendance at the committee-room while this bill was being formulated. It is a delusion to think that there were thirteen members on that committee; there were but eight, the five appointed from manufacturing States and favoring protection were absolutely ignored; they were not permitted to participate in the work of the committee, and were not recognized as having any right to act or to have a voice in its deliberations; and of the eight practically constituting the committee, six, as I have shown, come from a particular section.

Mr. Chairman, look next at the antecedents of these six members. Examine their surroundings with a view to determine their fitness for a proper discharge of the duties imposed upon them. Look at the States from whence they come. Does Texas furnish any such practical knowledge of the various interests to be affected as justifies clothing one of her Representatives with such power as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee possesses? When at home does he reside in a district having diversified industries? Before I close I will present some figures from official sources which will throw light upon this branch of the inquiry.

Next to Texas comes Tennessee, a State of such varied resources and conditions that in order to find materials adapted to the end in view the Speaker was obliged to select a district that furnished the required surroundings, and it was found not among the hills rich with minerals with which Providence has blessed that growing commonwealth—not in the new Tennessee, but in the old, where manufactures have obtained no foothold, and where diversified industries have no existence.

Arkansas was the next State which the Speaker thought was entitled to a position of power over questions affecting the whole country. She has within her borders untold material resources. Her coal fields and her forests, her rich ores and her richer soil, adapted to the culture of wheat, cotton, and sugar, will, under an enlightenment of her people, which can not long be delayed, lead her forth and cause her to shine with all the vigor of a new life, a peer among the grand States of this Union. But as yet she sleepeth. On the rich bottom-lands of the Arkansas and White Rivers cotton is still raised with success, even in the slipshod way peculiar to that region, but no diversity of production exists there. Here it was that a representative was found having the business experience of a cotton-planter, and he is the third on the committee we are analyzing. In all candor I submit that such experience does not and can not fit any one to act on the Ways and Means Committee for the advancement of the industrial interests of the entire country.

But let us go further in our work of analyzing this committee. Kentucky has the fourth place, a State which furnished to the councils of the nation the most gifted statesman the South has produced since the days of Thomas Jefferson, a man whose noblest instincts and early public efforts were in favor of the emancipation of the slave, and whose power in controlling national legislation and Southern sentiment was

overthrown only because the interests of slavery demanded free-trade instead of the American system of protection, for which he labored. I mean Henry Clay. I know, alas, too well how that great man yielded his convictions that he might gain the Presidency, and how he failed in reaching the goal of his ambition; but, sir, had he been content to stand firmly by freedom and protection, what greatness and what glory would have been her's to-day?

Such a lead must have been followed by State after State, until the whole South by peaceful and proper means would have become free; preparation for freedom and citizenship would have been secured to the negro in a manner which to enforced abolition was impossible. We should have had no internecine war with its immense cost in blood and treasure; and being one in sentiment, one in purpose, what imagination can portray the greatness and grandeur the Union would have achieved when the first centennial of its existence was reached.

But, sir, it did not so occur; the doctrines of free trade based upon the heresy of slave-labor were too subtle to be withstood. Calhounism became the doctrine of the South and of Kentucky, and behold the result. Unsurpassed in the salubrity of her climate, the fertility of her soil, the beauty of her scenery, the richness of her hills in mineral wealth, abundantly supplied with natural waterways adapted to cheap transportation, yet, with all these advantages, that State has fallen back, back, until she is as far behind her younger and naturally no better sister States in material progress as is the accomplished member from the Lexington district behind what he would be if he were to-day advocating the doctrines of protection, so ably maintained by his predecessor, Henry Clay.

But, sir, I venture to suggest that the adhesion of that gentleman to the doctrines of Kentucky's idolized statesman would have unfitted him in the eye of the Speaker for a place on the Ways and Means Committee. If but one of his eloquent utterances had been for protection, the oligarchy whose mouthpiece and effective manager was chosen to name this committee would have rejected this worthy Kentucky member as totally unfit for the purposes of Democracy in 1888.

Then Georgia comes in for a position which gives her an opportunity to especially express her ideas on the economic legislation of this nation, and that State has a right to so express herself; but would it not have been eminently proper to vary somewhat the monotony which we have found to have governed the action of the Speaker thus far? And if Georgia must be represented, why not take one from that portion of the State in which her vast mineral wealth, long hidden, now begins to be brought to light by the new order which universal freedom has inaugurated therein? Why have recourse to that Congressional district where slave labor for so long a time has been used for the production of a single staple, and where diversified industry has never yet secured a foothold? I will endeavor to make the answer plain further on.

The sixth and last State out of which this committee has been formed is West Virginia, a State that in the near future will demonstrate the fact that raw material, labor, and capital will be as strongly united in interest as her citizens will be overwhelmingly in favor of protection, for even now a change of 75 votes in that Congressional district would have deprived the Speaker of an opportunity to venture quite so near the old Mason and Dixon line to find a Representative who would give his sanction to the Mills bill.

Mr. Chairman, geography is a good guide in many important investigations; a careful study of locality aids the Speaker of this House to know where he may look for those upon whose action he can depend for the execution of his purpose. Why, sir, it will not be claimed that the Democrats on this floor from the excluded States—States in which there exists a condition of things furnishing actual experimental knowledge of the effect of diversified industries on the prosperity of the people—are not the peers of their fellow Democrats on this committee.

But, sir, it seems that the qualifications required by the Speaker are not good standing in the party, not ability to legislate, not experience with the leading industries of the country, not a broad-minded purpose to have the interests of all sections fairly represented; not any of these; but his idea was this, and only this, to select a committee which, from its surroundings and antecedents, as well as from the well-known devotion of its members to the doctrines of free trade, could be trusted to frame a bill which under the pretense of standing by all productive industries would, if it became a law, deal a fatal blow to protection.

Run this list over once more and you will find that four of its members were elected as Democrats without any opposing Republican candidate, and why? Let the peculiar methods now in vogue in certain sections of this country for silencing political opposition answer. I am dealing, Mr. Chairman, with sectionalism not as its defender, but to expose the most glaring and indefensible sectionalism which the political history of this country affords. The impropriety of looking to the States named for a Ways and Means Committee is shown by the following facts, compiled from the Tenth Census reports, from which is seen the relation these States bear in the number of manufacturing establishments, capital employed, and the annual value of their products to similar industries in the country:

States.	Estab- lish- ments.	Capital em- ployed.	Number of hands.	Wages.	Product.
Texas.....	2,996	\$9,245,561	12,159	\$3,343,087	\$20,719,928
Arkansas.....	1,202	2,953,130	4,550	925,358	6,756,150
Georgia.....	3,593	20,672,400	24,875	5,266,152	36,440,948
Tennessee.....	4,326	20,092,845	22,445	5,254,775	37,074,886
West Virginia.....	2,375	13,883,390	14,400	4,313,965	22,867,126
Kentucky.....	5,328	45,813,039	37,391	11,657,844	75,483,377
Totals.....	19,820	112,660,375	115,821	30,761,181	199,342,415

Now take six other States, but one of which has practically a representative on this committee, and see what place the census gives to them, as shown by corresponding data:

States.	Estab- lish- ments.	Capital em- ployed.	Number of hands.	Wages.	Product.
Illinois.....	14,549	\$140,652,066	144,727	\$57,429,085	\$414,864,673
Massachusetts.....	14,352	303,806,185	352,255	128,313,362	631,135,284
New York.....	42,739	514,286,575	531,533	198,634,029	1,080,696,596
Ohio.....	20,699	188,939,614	183,608	62,103,800	348,298,390
Pennsylvania.....	31,232	474,510,993	387,072	134,055,904	744,878,445
Missouri.....	8,592	72,507,844	63,995	24,309,716	165,386,205
Totals.....	132,163	1,694,663,277	1,663,190	604,845,946	3,385,189,593

Why, Mr. Chairman, the six States selected by the Speaker have only about 19,000 establishments, while the unrepresented States have 132,000, in round numbers, and \$112,000,000 of capital against \$1,694,000,000, and the number of hands employed are only 115,000 against 1,663,000; wages paid \$30,000,000 against more than \$600,000,000. The entire product of the six States represented by the six sectional members of the committee is less than \$200,000,000, and less than one-half of the same product in the State of Illinois alone. Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of a single rail mill in my own State the value of the output of which in the manufactured product for the past year amounted to \$3,000,000, with a pay-roll for wages alone of nearly a quarter of a million of dollars; considerably more than that of the entire State of Arkansas. The ore used at that mill was shipped by vessel and by rail, the coke and coal consumed were mined and manufactured at a distance and transported, giving employment at the mill and at the mines and in transportation to more men than were employed in manufacturing in the entire State of Arkansas in 1880.

Mr. Chairman, I desire now to compare the two classes of States named in respect to their agricultural importance, and for that purpose I beg leave to present the following table compiled from the Tenth Census, which demonstrates that not only in manufactures, but in agriculture, the six manufacturing States I have named were entitled to a representation in the committee in the persons of some of the able Democratic Representatives from those States who are honored with seats on this floor:

States.	Number of farms.	States.	Number of farms.
Arkansas.....	94,443	Ohio.....	247,189
Georgia.....	133,626	Illinois.....	255,741
Kentucky.....	168,453	Pennsylvania.....	213,542
Tennessee.....	165,680	New York.....	241,058
West Virginia.....	62,674	Missouri.....	215,575
Texas.....	174,184	Massachusetts.....	38,406
Total.....	804,030	Total.....	1,211,514

Total cereal production.

States.	Per cent.	Bushels.
Arkansas.....	1.03	27,670,856
Georgia.....	1.19	32,031,312
Kentucky.....	3.34	89,953,432
Tennessee.....	2.78	75,037,844
West Virginia.....	0.76	20,409,644
Texas.....	1.36	36,625,611
Total.....		281,727,499
Illinois.....	16.48	444,622,350
Missouri.....	9.22	248,839,405
Ohio.....	7.00	188,933,077
Pennsylvania.....	3.96	106,840,422
New York.....	3.33	89,962,704
Massachusetts.....	10.00	2,819,484
Total.....		1,081,981,439

I repeat, sir, that none of these great manufacturing and agricultural States are represented on the Ways and Means Committee by a Democrat save Pennsylvania, and some Democrats will question whether the Keystone State is properly represented after all. To be sure, the distinguished gentleman whose name stands seventh and last on the Democratic side on the register of this committee [Mr. SCOTT] lives in one corner of that great Commonwealth, but this fact does not of itself show that he represents the avowed sentiments of the people of his own State on the question of protection. It must be conceded, however, that his impress has been made on the Mills bill, for he is one of the largest owners and operators in soft coal in the United States, and yet that wonderful document appears to leave the duty on soft coal unchanged.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Democrats on this committee, with but two exceptions, were supporters of the lost cause; they were Confederates, and several of them officers in the rebel army. That army took the field for the purpose of establishing a government as different from our own in its primal doctrines and purposes as the Stars and Stripes differ from the Confederate flag. Their plan was to make human slavery the corner-stone of their political system, the central idea being that slavery furnishes the best and most desirable labor system possible. For a half century they had used their utmost endeavor to secure the adoption of that idea by this Government, and because a majority of the people clung to the Declaration of Independence and to the Constitution and would not accept the hideous doctrines of the slave power, they resorted to open rebellion. They adopted the principle that no branch of industry should be protected for the plain reason that their laborers being slaves would have no laborers to protect. Their constitution declared among other things:

SEC. 8. Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for a revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Such a constitutional provision as this demonstrates the sagacity and ability of the men who sought to erect a state on the idea that the workingmen should be the property of the owner of the soil and of the capitalist. It unquestionably meets the wants of such a government but it was rejected by the framers of our own Constitution as totally unsuited to "a government of, and for, and by the people."

Since then these members have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. "They are here in the house of their fathers, and intend to stay." They acknowledge that in the war they were overborne and obliged to lay down their arms, but they do not confess that they were wrong; on the contrary, they still insist that they were right on principle, and they are now advocates of the same political ideas they then put forth on economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, such is the record, fairly stated, of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and who by their unprecedented course towards the minority constituted themselves the entire committee; and in concluding what I have to say respecting it I submit that it would be unreasonable to expect from such a source a bill that ought to command the support of this House or the approval of the country.

THE STATUS OF THE FREEDMEN.

Mr. Chairman, the true inwardness and real purpose of those who are responsible for the present endeavor to break down protection can not be fully understood without considering the status of the negro, by whose muscle the labor of the South has been and in the main must be performed. True, he is no longer a chattel; he can not be put on the auction block as of old, but he is not regarded as a free man of right ought to be. His former owner finds by experience that the labor of the negro free is more valuable than was the labor of the negro slave, and for that, if for no other reason, there is no wish or purpose to re-enslave him; but it does not yet enter into the average Southern mind that the negro must become educated and must be protected in all of his civil rights; in short, a fellow-citizen equal with themselves, in order to enable the South to reach the material prosperity to which its natural resources entitle it.

Those who control the politics of the South do not as a whole desire that the colored man shall become educated, and they do not intend to permit him to enjoy or exercise the rights of a citizen, such as the amendments to the Constitution of the United States have vouchsafed to him. They do not think that it is proper to have the negro advance a single step beyond the condition of an unowned slave, and in that condition the people of the old planting States of the South still propose to have their laborers remain.

In those States where colored men are most numerous they are not heartily accorded their civil rights; they are tolerated rather in their quasi condition of freedmen for the cheap labor they furnish and for the political power their enumeration unjustly confers upon their old owners. I say unjustly, for by force and fraud the colored citizen is deprived of his vote, and yet that very citizenship goes to increase a representation which on this floor is employed to deprive the negro laborer and all other laborers of the protection to which they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, one of the strongest reasons I have for standing by

the principle of protection to American labor is the belief that just in proportion as the wonderful resources of the South come to be developed under the new era now dawning upon her, will education take the place of illiteracy, the recognition of all the civil rights of the negro take the place of their denial, which to-day is unblushingly practiced in the old planting States. What the South most needs is the development of her material resources, and this can only be secured by diversified industries, by manufactures wherewith to employ labor.

The negro is the laborer of the South, and no man will ever take his place. He is there "in the house of his fathers" eight millions strong, and he is there to stay. He must be educated in order to become a profitable laborer and a good citizen. He must be elevated from the low condition compatible with the plantation drudge to that higher state in which his naturally bright mental qualities can be brought out by actual endeavor and thought-inspiring work. In this new field the negro will vindicate his claim to manhood, and will by his own advancement secure the admiration of his fellow-men, and when this is done he will be as secure in the enjoyment of his citizenship as any one anywhere. Free trade will never bring to the South that happy day, but with protection it can not be long delayed.

If you will insist that the public debt can not be paid except at a high premium, and therefore taxation should be reduced, let it be done by taking off the enormous tax on sugar, and by removing internal-revenue taxation, so that the principle of protection to our industries may be preserved, and for that end give to the sugar industry a bounty to encourage to the utmost its production on our own soil. No doubt the tariff needs revision to remove inequalities and to simplify collection laws. Let that be done, and done by the friends and not by the enemies of protection. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the object of the bill before us nor of the party in power.

Sir, a fair adjustment is not the question before us. It is,

WHICH IS RIGHT, FREE TRADE OR PROTECTION?

They say free trade is right on principle, and they consent to violate that principle and adopt a wrong one far enough to collect the taxes required to defray the expenses of the Government economically administered.

It is difficult to find anywhere as much folly and political wickedness crowded into so few lines as this proposition contains. If absolute free trade between this country and foreign nations is right, why not adopt it and collect the taxes directly from the people, for whose benefit Government exists? Collect from property and accumulated wealth what it costs Government to protect them and from the individual what it costs to protect his life and liberty. That would be fair and honest; but to place all the burden of supporting the Government on those who consume manufactured goods and the necessities of life and let accumulated wealth in the form of either property or money go free is rank injustice.

I am for protection for the sake of protection, and not for revenue. If there be no better reason for maintaining duties on foreign goods than that it furnishes the best mode for raising revenue, then I will be against it. That method of taxation can not be defended standing by itself; with no compensating facts to sustain its equity, it is totally indefensible. I know it is justified on the ground of the ease with which the tax is collected when the tax-payer is not aware of the exaction, but I submit that such an argument is unworthy of intelligent men.

I am for protection because it surrounds the laboring man with conditions which secure to him employment at a rate of wages which enables him to pay the taxes imposed on the articles he consumes and then have more left to sustain himself and his family than he could possibly have on the other plan. I am for protection because it is the only way in which we can develop our own resources as a nation, employ our own muscle, our own machinery, our own brains, and our own capital, and in which these forces can work together in the most successful manner to promote the advancement of our own country. I am for my own country, and for the people of my own country, against the world.

But you say we propose to dispense with foreign trade. We have never failed to have commercial intercourse with the nations of the earth, and we propose to enlarge that intercourse; but not by reducing wages, and in this we radically differ from the advocates of free trade. They would follow in the footsteps of monarchies and extend commerce by reducing the condition of the employé to the level of the laborers of the Old World. This we will never do.

And now comes President Cleveland and tells us—

That the plain effect of our tariff laws is to raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties, and that millions of our people purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles.

This is a grave charge that the President has put in his message, and inasmuch as the duties on foreign importations average over 40 per cent., if the charge is true an awful burthen of taxation is laid on consumers which ought at once to be removed. But is it true? Or is it only the President's theory unsupported by facts, as the conditions which confront us when examined will abundantly prove?

This theory has been so many times disproved and shown to be utterly groundless by exhibitions of the prices at which our manufactories produce the goods consumed by our people that to repeat them would be useless. But, inasmuch as the President makes a special effort to convince the farmer and agriculturist that he is imposed upon and fearfully injured by protection, I will be pardoned for a single attempt to nail the false theory he seems so anxious to have believed like base coin.

Farmers use cut nails. In the year 1887 we made in this country 6,908,870 kegs of these useful articles of 100 pounds to the keg. The gross price of iron nails on the 16th of April last at Pittsburgh was \$1.90 per keg. The duty imposed by the existing tariff on cut nails is 1½ cents per pound. Now, if the President is correct, the people of the United States paid \$8,616,087.50 more for nails alone than they could have purchased them for, but for the "vicious and illogical" tariff. And it follows also that the same nails could have been bought in New York from English or Belgian nail-makers at 65 cents per keg of 100 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a Democrat in my Congressional district that believes the President is right. He may think he is honest possibly, but he will tell you the Chief Executive of this great nation has got beyond his depth and is dealing in theories that he does not comprehend. The logic is all on his side, but where are the facts? There is something in this protection business that is hard for a theoretical free-trader to understand, something "that giveth and yet increaseth."

Mr. Chairman, when a mere lad I stood in front of a country store in Ohio and saw a six-horse team, such as Thomas Corwin so graphically described, come lumbering up the road with its broad-tired wheels and its wagon-bed with heavy bows covered with linen that was spun and woven by hand. It was laden with 5 tons of merchandise, not a box or bale or cask of which had changed its place in that wagon since it was loaded in Chestnut street, Philadelphia. How many weary weeks had been consumed in the journey over the Alleghanies I do not know, but I learned since then that freight paid by the pioneer merchant in Ohio on that load of goods was \$6 per 100 pounds. About that time the State of Pennsylvania proceeded to build a canal to the West for the purpose of cheapening transportation and extending the commerce of her metropolis.

The farmers and teamsters of that State, many of them, were decidedly opposed to such a scheme. They were logicians like our President, and they demonstrated (to themselves) that when a canal-boat laden with 80 tons of freight could be hauled by a single mule, when it required sixteen six-horse teams to do the same work, the teamster's occupation would be gone, the farmers would no longer have a market for either horses or oats, and ruin was sure to come. But the canal was built and the farmer lived to see the prices of horses, oats, and farms doubled and quadrupled by the very condition from which he expected nothing but disaster. What was the matter with the Pennsylvania farmer? Mr. Chairman, it was simply this: He had never had an experience that caused him to look beyond the mere logic of the proposition to those forces and influences that were sure to come and contradict his theory, and that is what ails our President and all advocates of free trade.

But gentlemen on the other side tell us that protection does not protect the laborer. A few figures, taken from industries in my own immediate neighborhood, will show this statement to be as groundless as the one I have just discussed. I refer to coal mining, window-glass manufacturing, and bottle blowing, and give the following tables of prices paid in England, in Belgium, and in the United States. The prices paid are gathered from parties in whom I have the utmost confidence, and the figures they give are, as I personally know, exact.

COAL MINING.

Hon. Thomas Burt, M. P. for the Northumberland district in England, writing from Newcastle-upon-Tyne under date of April 23 last, gives a full account of the hours of labor and wages of the employés engaged in coal mining in that district, from which the following statement is made and the earnings of employés tabulated:

The hours of adults in the coal mines of Northumberland vary from seven to ten, from the time they leave the surface till they return, or, to quote the words of the act, "from bank to bank." The coal-hewers—who are the great majority of the workmen—are employed about seven hours. The hewers' work is exceedingly hard, and any one who has done it or seen it done,

WILL THINK THE HOURS LONG ENOUGH.

Deputies, stone-men, shifters, and laborers generally work eight hours a day. In some cases roller-way men and others employed in the transit of coal work ten hours a day. This longer period, however, applies only to comparatively few underground workers. Banksmen, screeners, and other persons employed on or about the pit-head usually work ten hours, and in some few cases eleven hours per day.

Having given the hours of labor, I proceed to state the rate of wages paid at the present time. Trappers, per day, 1s.; drivers, 1s. 2d.; putters are paid by the piece or score, and their average earnings are 2s. 9d. per day. In the case of adults the following wages are paid: Coal-hewers average, 4s. 7d. per day; stone men, about 4s.; deputies, 4s. 3d.; shifters, 3s. Officials are paid as follows: Overmen, £2; back-overmen, master shifters, and master wastemen, 32s. per week.

The earnings above stated, compared with wages paid for similar service in coal-mines of my district, are as follows:

Employés.	Northumber-land.	Illinois.
Trappers.....per day.....	\$0.24	\$0.75 to \$0.90
Drivers.....do.....	.28	1.25 to 2.25
Putters.....do.....	.67	1.25 to 2.25
Coal-hewers (miners) while employed.....do.....	1.10	1.25
Stone-men.....do.....	.96	2.00 to 2.25
Shifters.....do.....	.72	1.50 to 2.25
Overmen.....per month.....	40.00	1.00 to 1.50
Deputy overmen.....do.....	31.50	65.00

* Year round.

Now, take the window-glass and glass-bottle industries, both of which have obtained a foothold in my own neighborhood, and compare the wages paid in the State of Illinois with the wages paid for same service performed in foreign countries:

Table of wages paid for making window-glass in Belgium and Illinois.

Employés.	Belgium.	Pittsburgh and the West.
Blowers.....per month.....	*\$75.00	\$125.00 to \$150.00
Gatherers.....do.....	*25.00	70.00 to 90.00
Flatteners.....do.....	*25.00	100.00 to 140.00
Assistant flatteners.....do.....	*12.00	45.00
Cutters.....do.....	25.00	90.00 to 130.00
Master shearers.....do.....	30.00	90.00
Shearers.....do.....	15.00	45.00
Pot-makers.....do.....		90.00
Laborers.....do.....		35.00 to 40.00

* About.

Some blowers will make much more than the amount stated, but that is exceptional.

The wages in Belgium are for much longer hours and a greater number of days per annum. The workmen in the United States have averaged only about thirty-two weeks per year since 1883.

Next comes bottle-making. In Belgium and England first-class bottle-blowers get from \$1.60 to \$1.75 per day, while the earnings of the same class of workmen in Illinois amount to from \$5.50 to \$6 per day. Laborers of various kinds around bottle-works in Belgium and England get from 40 to 50 cents per day, while the same laborers in Illinois are paid from \$1.75 to \$2.50. These figures tell the story.

WHO ASKS FOR A CHANGE?

Mr. Chairman, who has petitioned Congress for the removal of duties on imported goods? Have mechanics or laboring men, manufacturers or operatives, mill-owners or workers in mills, mine-owners or miners, petitioned for a reduction of the tariff? How many agriculturists have asked for the passage of the Mills bill? There has been next to no demand for tariff reduction from the people of the United States. England and the Democratic party on this floor alone seem to be in a praying mood for the reduction of tariff rates. Has anybody save distillers asked that the internal-revenue tax on whisky should remain undisturbed? On the other hand, is it not true that two hundred thousand of as good and as earnest men and women as inhabit the several States have asked for the removal of that tax, knowing that it enables the producers of alcoholic drinks to wield their questionable business so as to make immense profits and at the same time create a political power which no other combine in the country can equal, not a jot or tittle of which is withheld from the Democratic party on election day in every town, city, or hamlet in this broad land?

Mr. Chairman, for one I am ready to repeal the internal-revenue tax on spirits, and in that way to reduce the surplus and break up the great whisky trust, for I think that rich and powerful combination, which now not only manufactures whisky, but builds its saloons and hires its bartenders in every place desirable for their nefarious business where the law permits, would fall to pieces in a single year after the repeal of the Government tax on whisky. I am not seeking for a way to promote the rum traffic; I am not anxious to lighten the burden of the rum-seller. In any municipality where public sentiment practically fails to prohibit the sale of intoxicants as a beverage, let the highest possible tax be levied on the retailer for the sole benefit of the tax-payer in those counties where the immense cost of the crime they cause to be committed has to be borne.

I pity the man who can look with indifference on that great destroyer of life, happiness, property, and good morals, dram drinking, which lays a heavy hand on the happiness and prosperity of the laboring men of this country. Of the nine hundred millions annually expended for drink it is safe to presume that one-half of it is taken from the pockets of laboring men, and for this vast contribution there comes no return but misery and crime. How many snug homes, filled with such comforts and delights as the human heart craves, would this worse than wasted sum bring to the family, making the light of hope and love to shine where now the thick darkness of despair so often casts its baneful shadow. Sir, show to me that by my voice or vote I can

even restrain this great evil in a practical way, and that voice and vote will not be wanting.

Talk of trusts; there is the Cotton-seed oil trust, the Standard Oil trust, and transportation combines, not one of which has any relation to tariff protection, but greater and more powerful than any in this country is the whisky trust. It and the Democratic party are one in interest—they are united in life, and in death they will not be divided. The internal-revenue tax on whisky will not be disturbed by Democratic votes, for this tax is the umbilical cord that insures the existence of both. It signifies its wish that the tax on whisky shall remain undisturbed, and the ready response of the President is, your wishes shall be gratified whatever may be the effect on the manufacturing interests of the nation that need protecting; and the Speaker, more than ready to sustain such a policy, so frames the committee that whisky is safe.

NATURE OF THE CONFLICT.

Mr. Chairman, the political conflict in which we are now engaged is the addenda to the late conflict of arms, and it has not come an hour too soon. The issue is made so clear by the action of the President that the disguises of this bill are of but little account. Free Trade vs. Protection is the title of the cause now on trial before the American people, and upon which we as jurors will in a few days be compelled to vote. That such is its true character is understood both by the workmen of America and the manufacturers of England. In proof of this I beg leave to insert here a copy of a preamble and resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of workmen held at Cooper Union, New York, on the 8th instant, which reads as follows:

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 workmen 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 workman 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 workmen 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-workmen 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 to every member of Congress.

And should any doubt exist in any mind as to how the manufacturers of England regard this movement, it would be dispelled by the following, from the London Saturday Review, which is only one out of twenty English editorials on the subject which are of similar import. It says that the message deals with a question which is as interesting to Englishmen as Americans, and it adds:

President Cleveland has devoted himself entirely to the tariff. It is impossible to recast this without touching directly the pockets of every citizen of the United States and indirectly influencing the commercial interests of the world. The President and the Democratic leaders have finally decided that they have nothing to gain by keeping measure any longer with the protectionists. They have, from whatever motive, resolved to adopt the free-trade policy. Nothing can be more explicit than the President's language. "The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury." In America this means free trade.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the decision of Congress on this question, it will be reviewed by the court of last resort in this country, the citizen, whose scepter of power is a free ballot, and to that grandest tribunal on earth this case must be submitted; and for one I can not doubt as to what the verdict will be. The good sense of the American people has never been appealed to in vain; their instinctive tendency is to right action, and whenever occasion calls for their serious thought an expression of their judgment has thus far proven to be indeed the voice of God. Mr. Chairman, in dignity and independence there is no sovereign on earth who can compare with the intelligent, independent, and fearless citizen of the United States who does not hold an office and who aspires to none. Such a one is without a peer, except it be his fellow-citizen in like condition. To such the destiny of the Republic is committed, and the first century of matchless progress through which they have conducted it justifies the faith that centuries to come will add to its glory and renown.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the President in his recent message apprised Congress that the proceeds of surplus taxation in the Treasury by June 30, the end of the current fiscal year, may be expected to reach the sum of \$140,000,000, including prior accumulations, or, more closely stated, the sum of one hundred and thirteen millions, apart from prior accumulations, over and above all authorized expenses, including the sinking fund for the current fiscal year. In reference to this condition, he proceeds:

Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public Treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad, and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessities. There appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

But 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.

From this utterance I understand the President to be averse to any reduction in internal taxation, as that mode of taxation affords, as he says, "no just complaint," and that "nothing is so well able to bear the burdens without hardship to any portion of the people." He further says our tariff laws are "the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and "ought to be at once revised and amended," and with intent "to enforce an earnest recommendation that the surplus revenues of the Government be prevented by the reduction of our customs duties," he urged upon Congress "immediate consideration" of these matters to the exclusion of all others.

These are distinct declarations and not susceptible of doubtful construction. In substance it is asserted that the reductions necessary should be made through the means of additions to the free-list and lower rates of duty on importations.

In the presence of such language, emanating from the Executive, authorized by direction of the Constitution to communicate and— from time to time give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient—

it is the imperative requirement of the representatives of the people of the United States to give fair, intelligent, and prompt attention to the suggestions made. I have done so, and as a remedy for the evils pictured, I introduced and had referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, on March 12 last, a bill—

to reduce and equalize duties on imports, to reduce internal-revenue taxes, and for other purposes.

An examination of the provisions of the bill mentioned shows the remedies I would apply are at variance with those recommended by the President. He seeks to prevent the continuance of surplus revenue by a resort to changes in our customs duties only. The remedy I propose is through a repeal of internal-revenue taxes as well as by a full revision of the tariff, as promised to the people by the Democratic convention which assembled in Chicago in 1884.

The reductions provided for in the bill alluded to would aggregate on internal taxation about \$70,000,000. It repeals the entire internal tax on tobacco and fruit brandies; it repeals the license tax on wholesale and retail dealers, leaving these for such control by State authority as the respective States may see fit; it makes all alcohol used in the arts and manufactures free, and reduces the tax on whisky to 50 cents per gallon.

These taxes have always been the last to be levied and the first to be repealed when no longer needed. It was the boast of Jefferson that he had given the death-blow to the excise tax, "that most vexatious of all taxes," at the commencement of his administration; and among other things for which he received the thanks of the Legislature of his native State on his retirement from office was for "internal taxes abolished."

The first tax also to be repealed after the war of 1812 was the excise tax, which was recommended by Madison, and was the first law enacted under the administration of Monroe.

The Democratic convention of 1884 declared that "the system of direct taxation known as the internal revenue is a 'war tax,'" and this declaration, taken in connection with other declarations in the platform which I will quote further on, clearly establishes the fact that the opinion of the convention was that the internal-revenue "war" taxes should first go, and should all go whenever a sufficient sum was realized from custom-house taxes to meet the expenses of the Government, economically administered. We are practically in such condition now, and a true response to these instructions warrants the repeal of the internal laws to the extent the bill proposes.

I favor now, as I have always done, a total repeal of the internal-revenue taxation. [Applause.] In the bill which I introduced I proposed to sweep all these taxes off the statute-book except 50 cents on whisky, and I would transfer the collection of that tax to the customs officials, if upon examination and reflection it was found to be practicable.

Some of the reasons which induced me to form this judgment and

now to adhere to this course I can not better state than by a repetition of some of my former expressions in this connection:

With Albert Gallatin I have regarded the excise or internal-revenue taxes as offensive to the genius of our people, and tolerated by the framers of the Constitution only as a measure of necessity in the emergency of war, and that just so soon as the occasion for them had passed away they should cease to exist. He and Thomas Jefferson, as the very first act of Jefferson's administration, secured a repeal of internal taxes and relieved the people from their inequality, inquisitorial annoyances, and hordes of officials clothed with dangerous powers. Only in these latter days have I heard men calmly claim these war taxes are still necessary—a generation after the war which gave rise to them had closed. And it is a very suggestive and suspicious feature of the affair that those upon whom the tax is laid clamor loudly against its being taken off, regarding it no doubt as a protection against competition to the large monopolies.

To substantiate the ground taken by me in that letter, I will refer to two authorities. I will read first from Blackstone's Commentaries (book 1, pages 317, 318) to show excise is a war tax:

But at the same time the rigor and arbitrary proceedings of excise laws seem hardly compatible with the temper of a free nation. For the frauds that might be committed in this branch of the revenue, unless a strict watch is kept, make it necessary, wherever it is established, to give the officers the power of entering and searching the houses of such as deal in excisable commodities at any hour of the day, and, in many cases, of the night likewise. And the proceedings in cases of transgression are summary and sudden.

However, its "original establishment was in 1643, and its progress was gradual both sides protesting it should continue no longer than to the end of the war, and then be utterly abolished. * * * But from its first origin to the present time its very name has been odious to the people of England." It has been kept up, however, to supply the enormous sums necessary to carry on the continental wars of Europe.

So believed Jefferson; and let us next see what he did. I read from Schouler's History of the United States, volume 2, page 21:

In economy and retrenchment the President had already made a beginning by reducing the diplomatic establishment and consolidating some revenue offices subject to executive control. The movement now contemplated was to abolish that whole system of internal taxation, which he had heartily detested as tyrannous, burdensome, and liable to abuse of patronage; which had always been unpopular in the Middle and Southern country, and which cost more than the first three years' net produce to put down resistance to its collection. But excise receipts had risen gradually to the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, and many feared that the Treasury would suffer if this resource was suddenly cut off. Jefferson had, however, gone over the ground carefully with Secretary Gallatin; against the present yield of the internal taxes they set off what the Government might safely economize elsewhere.

Customs duties alone would, as they correctly surmised, supply a revenue sufficient to support the Federal establishment, and, besides paying interest on the public debt, extinguish its principal, should peace continue, in fifteen or eighteen years. Federalists were incensed, and those with friends in place tried to induce a repeal, only partial at most, but the tax was laid to the root, and with the downfall of this system went along with the offices at the disposal of the Administration.

In addition I then said and now repeat that if this internal-revenue system were abolished to-day we would have no surplus revenue to scare us, while the administration of public affairs would be rendered purer and better.

On the tariff the bill embraces a revision of the entire system on principles believed to be in harmony with the last authoritative declaration of the Democratic party, from which I quote, as follows:

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of the Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be.

All taxation should be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages existing in this country.

This declaration of principles clearly recognizes the fact that a difference exists in the cost of the production of commodities in this and other countries in consequence of the higher rate of wages existing in this country, and declares for duties ample to cover this difference.

This is the cardinal principle that must govern in any intelligent revision of our tariff. Our industrial system differs from that of any other country in the important fact that labor in this country receives a much larger share of what is annually produced than in any other. It is believed to be demonstrable that this advantage to labor can be maintained only by giving to our industries protection equal to the difference. Whether this difference be expressed by wages or by what wages will command for wage-earners, does not matter in the final analysis. The question is, what proportion of the annual products of labor and capital combined does labor receive, and how much larger is that proportion in our system than in any other? It may not be possible to state exactly this difference, but statistics are abundant enough to prove that the difference is largely in favor of American labor. No one will deny that an industrial system under which annual products are most widely distributed and in which labor receives as its share a larger proportion is the better system.

As the name of Edward Atkinson has been referred to in this debate, publishing his opinion which was given a long while ago, let us see how he speaks of recent events in his late article on "Low prices, high wages, small profits; what makes them?" He says that—

Since the end of the civil war, in 1865, and yet more since the so-called panic of 1873, there has been greater progress in common welfare among the people of this country than ever before. It has been the period in which there has been the greatest application of science and invention to the production and distri-

bution of food that ever occurred in any single generation in the history of this or any other country; and food is the prime necessity of material life. * * * The cost of the material for food, of materials for clothing, boots, and shoes, and of fuel, probably represents about 70 per cent. of the cost of living on the part of well-to-do mechanics, railway employes, or of other persons in analogous occupations who may be considered in the average position of working people. All these elements of life have declined very greatly in their prices in the period under consideration. * * * Some one has wisely and wittily said that "It does not much matter what happens to the millionaire; how is it with the million?"

If it shall appear that out of this great reduction in prices the millions have gained higher wages; that hundreds of thousands of families have gained better homes and greater comfort in life; while those who have suffered temporary loss have been only the rich who have been incapable of adjusting themselves to the new conditions, or the unskilled poor who have been unable to grasp the greater opportunities for welfare which invention has offered them, then may we not come to the conclusion that diminished profits and low prices are merely the complement of higher wages and lower cost, and are therefore most certain indications of general progress from poverty to welfare, yet still leaving the problem open, how to help the unskilled poor?

This would seem to settle the question as to whether we should adhere to the beneficent policy pursued of encouraging and protecting our own home manufactures by the protection which necessarily results from any proper adjustment of duties in any tariff bill for the purpose of raising revenue to carry on the Government economically administered. It demonstrates unmistakably the truth of what those who agree with me have contended would be the result. To increase wages products must be increased, for in the end wages are but the laborers' share of products. While a dollar may buy more in another country than here, a day's labor, which is the crucial test, will exchange for more of the necessities and comforts of life here than anywhere else. [Applause.]

Under free trade this advantage which accrues to labor would disappear. It is impossible that it should be otherwise; for if a tariff does not in itself give higher wages to labor, it does preserve from destructive competition a system in which labor can and does receive as its reward better wages or a larger share of the fruits of its own toil than in any other system. No two industrial systems side by side, with labor in one receiving double the wages of labor in the other, could long exist under free trade between them. Too much stress can not be laid upon such facts as these, because on them hinges the necessity of protecting American industries, in order to preserve the advantages to labor that have arisen under them; and who would wish to see that system overthrown and reconstructed on the basis of other countries, with labor kept at the level of a bare existence, and with no hope of ever bettering that condition?

Before proceeding to explain the principles and provisions of the bill which I introduced, as it affects the tariff, I will stop to refer to a few of the fundamental propositions which have been persistently maintained throughout this debate, and which appear to exercise a controlling influence over the opinions of so many.

First. That duties are always added to the price which the consumer must pay.

On articles not produced in this country this is doubtlessly true, as a general rule, and measurably true also on articles in part produced in this country but not sufficient to supply the entire demand. But on all those commodities produced in sufficient abundance to supply, or measurably supply the home market, different principles control. In that case competition, where it is free to operate, determines the prices of the various products and the foreign producer comes to this as a market where prices are fixed, and the duties are what he pays for the privilege of entering our market. [Applause.]

Another erroneous proposition is that duties on articles produced in this country are a tax or bounty which the consumer pays to the manufacturer, by means of which the manufacturer derives larger profits than prevail in other industries.

If this were true it is not easy to see what justification could be offered for the committee bill any more than for the present tariff laws. But that this, as a general rule, is erroneous becomes apparent enough on a closer examination of the laws of trade which prevail under all systems.

That there is a tendency in every industrial system to an equalization of profits on capital and wages of labor is an admitted principle of political economy. Adam Smith long ago laid down the proposition that larger profits in one industry than in others could not long prevail in the same country. Other economists state the same principle. Suppose that, with our industries constituted as they are, we formed a world by ourselves, would it be claimed that one class, as consumers, paid a perpetual tax to another class, as producers? Would not rather the economic law just stated prevail? Such would be the condition, too, under a tariff entirely prohibitory. The same law, too, operates under a tariff that covers the difference in the cost of production between this and other countries.

Of course the tendency to an equalization of profits on capital and wages of labor never reaches a dead-level, because of the varying conditions and influences under which production and consumption go on.

From these principles it follows that all who participate in an industrial system are partakers of its benefits, whether they are employed in one industry or another—not the manufacturer alone, but the laborer; in short, all who produce and exchange products are alike bene-

fited under this system, and that is the system we seek to continue by a proper adjustment of tariff duties. Only those who have fixed incomes or are in office for life with fixed salaries, would be benefited by the overthrow of this system and the establishment of free trade. But this is the last class that has a right to complain.

Still another assumption is that any class of producers—for instance, the agricultural class or the wage-earners—could continue indefinitely to sell their products, or their services, in our present higher market, and at the same time buy the products or the services of others in cheaper markets. That this is not possible becomes clear enough on the most casual examination. If the farmer ceases to buy the products of the manufacturers, he will certainly cease to sell to them, and must sell his products in the market where he buys what he consumes himself. Suppose last year we had manufactured a thousand millions' worth less than we did and had gone abroad for these products, expecting to pay for them with agricultural products; could a thousand millions more of agricultural products have been sold abroad at the price such products brought here? We sold all the wheat and corn and meat products that Europe would take at the prices that prevailed. Who can tell at what prices Europe would have taken even five hundred millions or one hundred millions more of our agricultural products than she did take? The mere statement of the proposition is enough to disclose the error on which it is founded, and shows the importance of uniting manufactures with agriculture, or, as Jefferson states it, put the manufacturer by the side of the farmer. In fact, both must, in our country, depend almost exclusively on our home market. It is folly, if not a crime, to attempt a change in these respects. It would bring ruin and bankruptcy without the possibility of having such a result accomplished. The greater the diversity of industries in any country, the greater the wealth-producing power of the people, and the more there is for labor and capital to divide, and the more independent that country becomes. [Applause.]

I now come to the principles on which the bill I have introduced is framed.

The bill embraces a full revision of the tariff.

It carries to the free-list many articles which enter into consumption as raw material, or otherwise, and in the production of which there is no injurious competition between this and other countries.

In fixing the tariff rates the aim has been to adjust the duties as nearly as possible to cover the difference in the cost of production in this and other countries, arising from the different conditions I have stated. This rule has been extended to all the industries embraced in our system where climatic or other causes do not put us at a disadvantage in carrying on production.

In working out the details of the bill under these principles it has been my purpose to lower the duties wherever possible and reduce the revenues.

But here we come upon principles that require careful attention. Between the extremes of free trade on the one hand and a prohibitory tariff on the other there are three principles, one or the other of which must govern in levying a tariff. First, revenue only, or an even rate of duty on all imports, just high enough to yield the revenue needed to support the Government.

Second, maximum revenue; that is, a tariff that will yield the largest possible revenue.

Third, a tariff to cover the difference in cost of production in this and other countries.

The points important to consider in connection with these principles is, that the line of "revenue only" falls below either of the others, and that the line of maximum revenue (which is the largest product resulting from multiplying the rate of duty on any article by the quantity imported) is always and necessarily below the line of difference in the cost of production. Consequently, to lower the rate of duty, until the line of maximum revenue is passed, must result in an increase of revenues and not a decrease. To reduce the rate from the line of maximum revenue down, will result, of course, in reduced revenues. On the other hand, to raise the rate until the line of maximum revenue is reached, is to increase the revenues; but from the line of maximum revenue up, an increase in the rate of duty necessarily results in reduced revenues. To ignore these principles is to act blindly, and any computations calculated to show the results of changes in the tariff that do not take these facts into account are utterly worthless.

An all-important consideration in connection with these principles, as will be seen from a close inspection, is that, in order materially to reduce revenues by reducing the rate of duties on competing industries, it is necessary to go below the maximum revenue line, that is, below the line of fair or even competition, and give the advantage to foreign manufacturers.

It is for this reason, it is believed, that the committee bill in very many cases, and especially where ad valorem duties are substituted for existing specific rates, will result in an increase rather than a decrease of the revenues.

To determine just where the line of difference in cost falls is, of course, in many instances, difficult; but it may be safely assumed, and has been adopted as a governing rule in preparing the bill I have introduced, that when the importations in any line of commodities is

large and increasing from year to year (and no good reason appears why the things can not be as well produced here), that the duties are below the cost line, and that the advantage is with the foreign producer. If production in the same line is diminished, or suspended altogether, in this country, it becomes proof positive that the advantage is too great to be overcome without a readjustment of duties.

Where importations are light or not increasing, it may consistently be assumed that the duties are quite high enough and in many cases may be safely reduced; and in case the industries are of such a nature as to permit trusts or combinations of any kind to raise prices above the level of prices or profits in other industries, then it becomes important that the cost line should be closely adhered to.

It is less important, of course, to apply this rule rigidly where prices are regulated through free competition. In such cases, under the economic principles I have stated, the tendency is always to a general level in profits, wages, and prices in all industries.

And before leaving this point I wish to state distinctly that if in any case it can be made to appear that the measure I have proposed gives more protection than is needed to cover the difference in the cost of production, I am ready to lower it; on the contrary, if in any instance the rate of duty is too low to cover this difference, I am ready to help raise it; and on this principle in the bill, I have offered the duty on a few articles has been increased, as I shall later on explain.

Again, if it is made to appear that the present duties, or the rates proposed in my bill in any way are made use of, or can be, to foster monopolies, I stand ready to apply the remedy. Monopolies may and do exist, with or without the tariff. Certainly the greatest monopolies and trusts in this country now—the Standard Oil trust, the whiskey trust, the cottonseed-oil trust, and others I might name, have no connection with our tariff laws. I have never advocated a tariff for the purpose of supporting monopolies, but for the protection of labor, and I am for the protection of labor, not at one stage merely, but at all stages in the production of any commodity. I am for the protection and maintenance of an industrial system that allows to labor better reward than any other. I believe such a system to be the outgrowth of our better form of government and our higher civilization, and that its overthrow will endanger the very existence of our institutions. [Applause.]

ADMINISTRATIVE FEATURES OF THE BILL, SPECIFIC DUTIES.

The late Secretary Manning signalized his administration of the Treasury Department by a more complete and thorough inquiry into the administration of the customs service than had ever been attempted by his predecessors. His annual reports for the years 1886 and 1887 on the collection of duties, his report on the revision of the tariff in February, 1886, and his various special communications to the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means of Congress, are monuments of his marvelous, effective, and conscientious labors in this regard. In all these he urged a thorough and complete revision of the tariff and the elimination of its many ambiguities, which had led to endless disputes and litigation and consequent hardships to importers and losses to all interests concerned. He urgently and repeatedly dwelt upon the necessity for the substitution of specific for ad valorem duties wherever practicable, not only in the interest of good administration, but as a guard against fraud and to protect the honest trader.

In these views respecting specific duties he was supported by the almost unanimous opinions of the leading importing merchants as well as the principal manufacturers of the country, whose testimony on the subject he transmitted to Congress with his report on the revision of the tariff.

The customs officers, charged with the immediate work of appraising imports and collecting duties, also gave emphatic and convincing testimony to the importance of the adoption of the system of specific instead of ad valorem rates.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, in an able letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, dated June 14, 1886, presented unanswerable arguments in favor of the application of specific duties in place of high ad valorem rates, particularly as to silks, laces, embroideries, and leather gloves.

In submitting schedules covering these articles and recommending their adoption by Congress, he said:

Should the recommendations herein made be adopted, it is confidently believed that the greater part of the contentions constantly prevailing at the port of New York with respect to appraisements will disappear, importations by regular merchants throughout the country become general, and the full duties provided by the laws be secured at a diminished cost of collection.

In his last annual report to Congress he also used the following language:

Whatever the rates of customs taxation may be the laws for collection of the same should be made as efficient as possible. In this the bona fide importer who wishes to gain only the legitimate profits of his business, the home manufacturer, and laborer are equally interested. They all have a right to demand that the laws be so administered as to give them every possible protection in their business. The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is, therefore, desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem so far as the nature of the merchandise will permit. Theoretically considered ad valorem are preferable to specific duties, but in practice, under such rates as we have had and must continue to have for years to come, the former are the too easy source of deception

and inequality at the custom-house. Congress has it in its power to change, from time to time, as may be advisable, specific rates so as to meet any permanent changes in values.

In matters relating purely to the administration of the laws I esteem it to be the duty of Congress to consider carefully and to act upon the advice of the executive officers, who know the facts and are charged with the responsibility of the administration of the law; and in the preparation of the bill presented by me I have conformed to this view; and as a part of the work of revision of the tariff the aim has been to remove the incongruities and inequalities with which it abounds and which have been so fruitful of lawsuits and losses to the revenue and merchants, and which have been obstacles in the way of honest and orderly administration.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES.

In adjusting the rates under the various schedules information has been sought and obtained, so far as practicable, from those having knowledge of the industries affected, and these interests have been duly considered in arranging the details of the bill.

It is estimated that the customs revenue will be reduced by this bill something over \$20,000,000 per annum. These reductions are distributed throughout the various schedules, reductions being larger in some than in others.

Of all the industries in this country those deriving least direct benefit from tariff laws are the products of agriculture, and no material reduction in rates on these products has been deemed advisable. One important change proposed in one of the schedules is that imposing a specific rate of duty on animals. This, it is believed, will prove a better measure of protection to our stock-raisers and wool-growers. There has been much complaint among wool-growers over the depression in the domestic wool market since the enactment of the tariff in 1883. This depression, it is believed, is in large measure due to evasions of duty by the importation of wool tops and waste—which the bill corrects—and the discrimination in our present tariff between worsted and woolen cloths, which has well nigh driven worsted manufactures from this country. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, refers to this interest in these words:

A conspicuous example of the inequalities of the tariff is found in the discrimination in the rates of duty imposed on woolen and worsted cloths.

And adds:

There is much reason to believe that the manufacture of worsted cloths must soon cease in this country unless the tariff law in this regard is amended.

Careful attention has been given in the bill to this subject, with a view to remedy the evils complained of and to restore this important industry to the United States.

The time allotted to me in this discussion will not permit detailed reference to the different schedules. This must be left to other occasions, but certain provisions in the metal schedule having been sharply assailed, I feel compelled to occupy a little time in the consideration of a few items.

THE METAL SCHEDULE.

In the metal schedule the reductions in rates apply to a majority of the articles therein enumerated, and include iron and steel rails, bar-iron, plate-iron, iron and steel fish-plates, nails and tacks, iron and steel beams, girders, and other structural iron, railway wheels, iron and steel ingots for making wheels and tires, sheet-iron, hoop-iron, anchors, tubes, axles, chains, screws, needles, horseshoes, mechanics' tools, castings, hollow-ware, copper, lead, and various other manufactures of metal. A comparison of the two bills will show that the reduction of duties extends to many more articles in this schedule than does the committee's bill. Certain articles in this schedule, namely, bronze-powder, taggers' iron, tin andterne plates, cotton-ties, iron and steel wire rods and ingots, billets, slabs, and blooms, are dutiable under the present tariff at such low rates, or at ad valorem rates which are so easily and largely evaded, that their home production is either wholly prevented or seriously restricted, so that the greater part of the revenue derived from this schedule comes from the large and constantly increasing importation of these articles.

TIN-PLATE.

Particular objection has been made to the increased rate of duty provided for in the bill introduced by me above the existing law on tin-plate. The present rate is 1 cent per pound, the proposed rate 2.10 cents per pound. This increase is necessary to secure the production of tin-plate in the United States.

At present tin-plate making is practically unknown in this country, though we are as well fitted to make it as England and Wales, from which countries most of our tin-plate come. The United States is the largest consumer of tin-plate in the world. We take nearly two-thirds of the production of Great Britain. Within six years we have paid British manufacturers over \$100,000,000 for tin-plate, besides paying freight. This is too much money to send out of the country for an article which we are capable of producing at home.

The value at the port of export of the tin-plate imported during the year ending June 30, 1887, was \$16,883,813. As near as I can learn, the total wages paid the British laborers in the production of the tin-plate imported into the United States last year were about \$9,000,000. My wish is that such amount be expended in our own country, and

that it go to our own wage-earners. The rate fixed would induce such extended manufacture, that in my judgment, by reason of competition and the law of demand and supply, the price would not be higher after twelve months than we are now paying for the same article, and would put the manufacture of tin-plate where, by proper inspection laws, it could be kept free from poisonous adulterations when manufactured for canning purposes. At the same time it would create such a demand for labor as to give employment to every idle iron and steel worker in the country, and thus enable labor to maintain a standard of wages that would secure to the workingman reasonable remuneration and a respectable livelihood. It would also give additional employment to labor in the production of coal, iron ore, coke, limestone, and other materials. There were imported into the United States about 255,000 gross tons of tin-plate in 1887, which represent 870,000 tons of iron ore, 300,000 tons of limestone, 1,800,000 tons of coal and coke, 360,000 tons of pig-iron, 5,000,000 pounds of lead, 25,000,000 pounds of tin, 12,000,000 pounds of tallow and palin oil, 35,000,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, 12,000,000 feet of lumber, and, in addition, fire-brick, clay, oil, and other lubricants, hemp, etc.

It would require sixty-eight large works of five trains of rolls each, involving an outlay of \$30,000,000 capital, and employment to about 24,000 workmen, who would earn at least \$12,000,000 in wages. All this would be accomplished, I believe, without the least injury, within one year to any consumer of tin-plate in the United States.

COTTON-TIES.

Cotton-ties are used chiefly for baling cotton, rags—waste, and similar articles. They are made of hoop-iron. The hoops are usually 1 inch wide by No. 18 wire gauge thick, are cut to lengths of 11 feet each, punched, have a buckle riveted or attached to them, are varnished or painted, and put into bundles of 50 pounds each.

The present rate on cotton-ties is one of the most marked inconsistencies of the tariff, as they bear a less rate of duty than the article out of which they are made.

It is plain that these cotton-ties should not only bear no less a duty than is levied on hoop-iron, of which they are made, but it is fair that they should pay an additional duty, equal to the additional labor cost. They do not now bear the hoop-iron duty, and yet it is proposed in the bill before the House to place cotton-ties on the free-list. In the act of 1883 the duty was put at 35 per cent. ad valorem, which, on the invoice price, is equal to a duty of four-tenths of a cent a pound, while No. 18 hoop-iron, 1 inch wide, bears a duty of 1.2 cents per pound. It is thus seen that cotton-ties pay, under the existing law, but one-third the duty on the articles from which they are made. This is a positive discrimination against the home manufacturer in favor of the foreign producer and shipper, and the foreigner to-day controls the market in this country. In 1887 the average invoice value per pound of cotton-ties imported was 1½ cents. The average invoice value of hoop-iron not thinner than No. 20, imported, was 2½ cents per pound. In other words, the cotton-ties made out of 1 and No. 18 hoop were invoiced at about one-half the invoice price of the hoop-iron out of which they were made. The invoices on cotton-ties are undervaluations, of course, and the injury done to the American manufacturers is greatly aggravated by the application of an ad valorem duty, a system which gives most protection where least is needed and the least protection where most is needed. In a word, permits the foreign manufacturer and the American importer to fix the rates of duty on imports, and not those who administer our tariff laws.

The placing of cotton-ties on the free-list prevents any hope of their production in the United States, for the rate of wages for rolling and heating a ton of cotton-ties in England is \$2.31; in Pittsburgh, \$4.10, nearly double, and so on all through. The cotton-growers of the cotton belt do not suffer in any way as regards the price of cotton-ties. They sell their entire bales, including bagging and iron, at cotton rates, and no tare is charged in this country and the charge abroad is borne by the shipper. There is no reason or equity in the proposition to place this article on the free-list.

WIRE RODS, ETC.

The clause in the present tariff as to wire rods reads as follows:

Iron or steel rivet, screw, nail, and fence, wire rods, round, in coils and loops, not lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, valued at 3½ cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound. Iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs, for the manufacture of fencing, six-tenths of a cent per pound.

In the bill which I introduced limitation to sizes smaller than No. 5 is abandoned, and the rate is based on value.

The present rates of duty are six-tenths of a cent per pound on sizes not smaller than No. 5 wire gauge, and 45 per cent. ad valorem (according to the rulings of the New York custom-house) on smaller sizes. I propose to make it 1 cent per pound.

This rate will not, it is believed, on a fair valuation, exceed 45 per cent., if it reaches that. Relative to the duties at present collected on these articles, a statement from the Treasury Department says:

Steel wire rods lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, not being specially provided for, fall under the provision "for all forms or kinds of steel not specially enumerated," at 45 per cent. ad valorem, while both iron and steel wire rods above No. 5 wire gauge are provided for at six-tenths of a cent per pound, or \$13.44 per ton. Enormous quantities of the article lighter than No. 5 have been imported at values which, at 45 per cent., have yielded a duty of only the equivalent

of \$11 per ton. Thus a lower rate of duty is apparently collected upon the finer and more costly than upon the coarser and cheaper article.

The statistics show that the importations of iron and steel wire rods not lighter than No. 5 wire gauge were invoiced at an average value in 1886 of about 1½ cents per pound, while steel wire rods lighter than No. 5 wire gauge were invoiced at an average value of only 1.1 cents per pound. This would seem to indicate that the latter was undervalued, since (being finer) they are supposed to be worth more than the article invoiced at 1½ cents.

It is impossible for our manufacturers to make wire rods under the present tariff. Taking into account the price and the duty on pig-iron, and the cost of the various processes necessary to convert it into wire rods, including loss of material, the rate I propose is less than the average rates imposed on heavy bar-iron under the present tariff, and is the same as is proposed by the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on ordinary bar-iron of coarser size. It should be borne in mind that wire rods do not go directly into consumption by the people in that form, but are mainly used by the manufacturers of wire. There is no bill before Congress which proposes any reduction of rates of duty on barbed, galvanized, and other wire used for fencing. These rates have practically kept such foreign wire out of our market, and while they remain unchanged there can be no appreciable increase in the price to the farmer of his wire for fencing, notwithstanding an increase in the duty on wire rods.

During the year 1887 there was imported into the United States 334,698,837 pounds of these rods, of which 247,730,164 pounds were steel, lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, paying duty at 45 per cent. ad valorem, equal to \$10.80 per ton, which is less than the duty proposed by the bill of the committee on heavy railway bars, and is only \$4.80 per ton more than the same bill proposes on pig-iron. Even my colleague from the Erie district, with his disposition to figure down the cost of manufacturing metals in this country, would hardly pretend that this margin is sufficient to cover the difference between labor in this country and abroad in the manufacture of this article.

The rate proposed in my bill is not more than sufficient to cover the cost, and its adoption will give work to home laborers, prevent the large and increasing importations, and result in large reduction of revenue.

STEEL INGOTS, BLOOMS, AND SLABS.

In the bill which I introduced a change is made from ad valorem duties, as authorized by existing law, to specific rates. The reason for this is "to guard against undervaluations which are shown to have been extensively practiced, particularly in blooms and slabs, which have been invoiced below 1 cent per pound. These undervaluations have been sources of just complaint by reputable merchants and domestic producers."

That the present rates are too low is evident from the enormous increase in importations since the act of 1883 went into effect. What that increase has been will be seen from the following table:

Table showing the importation of various grades of steel, 1884-1887.

Articles.	1884.	1886.	1887.
Bars, billets, etc., valued at 4 cents a pound or less.....	28,639,833	95,537,092	323,180,960
Ingots: cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, valued at 4 cents a pound or less.....	11,548,375	38,752,868	279,819,950

In the ordinary course of business there has been no such increase in the demand in this country for steel in this form as to justify any such increase in importation as above. It has come because the advantage on account of this low rate of duties has given the foreigner the possession of the American market.

The average entered value of this merchandise in 1887 was only \$17.75 per ton, which, at 45 per cent. ad valorem, is less than \$8 per ton, or only about \$1.28 more than the duty now imposed on pig-iron, and only \$2 per ton more than is proposed by the bill of the committee.

I apprehend, sir, no gentleman on this floor will contend that this is not an inequality which should be corrected. It is manifest that a necessity exists for a revision and change in the rates on these several articles, and the rates suggested have been made with reference to the cost of production, and are in harmony with the rates on iron ore and pig-iron, and are no more than necessary to compensate for the difference between the cost of labor and other legitimate costs of manufacture in this country and abroad. The adoption of these rates would largely prevent the enormous flood of importations, give the work to our mills and laborers, and cause a large reduction of revenue.

DECREASE OF REVENUE.

The statement has been recklessly made on this floor within a few days that the changes proposed in my bill in the metal schedule would cause an increase in duties of about \$9,000,000. This statement was directed presumably to the particular articles to which I have just made extended reference. I have shown that these changes would largely decrease rather than increase the revenue from these articles. I now emphatically assert that the changes proposed throughout the metal schedule would cause a reduction in revenue of over \$6,000,000. This result is arrived at by fair and logical estimates, and

not by that wonderful method of computation by which my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] sought to demonstrate the other day that a duty of \$5.50 per ton would be a sufficient protection on steel rails made from pig-iron paying a duty of \$6.72 per ton.

COST OF STEEL RAILS.

Respecting the cost of steel rails at the works of Carnegie Brothers, which my colleague has presented, I will give some figures which have been furnished to me, and which I believe to substantially correct, although I have not had time to test the same. At any rate, they will serve to show the worthlessness of estimates made up from imperfect knowledge of industrial processes and which take into account only the cost of the last stages of production.

Pig metal required for a ton of rails, 2,610 pounds, costing.....	\$19.83
Spiegelstein and manganese.....	3.24
Cost of labor in the mill.....	4.80
Cost of ingot-molds, fire-brick, fire-clay, coke, oil, maintenance, etc.....	3.20

Making total cost of ton of rails.....	31.07
From this deduct 285 pounds steel scrap.....	\$2.18
Deduct also 10 per cent. from wages of 1888.....	.48
	2.66

Leaving as the actual cost.....	28.41
---------------------------------	-------

including those sold as second class. This does not include interest on or profits on capital.

All rails are sold on five years' guaranty, to be replaced, if found defective, at the expense of the manufacturers.

Respecting structural iron, I insert a letter from Belgian makers offering beams, girders, and structural iron for bridges, etc., promising a "nice profit" to all who secure orders. I consider that this circular letter is a complete answer as to the insufficiency of the rate fixed in the committee's bill.

LA PROVIDENCE ROLLING-MILLS.

[General agent for United States of America and Dominion of Canada, Andris-Jochams, Charleroi, Belgium.]

CHARLEROI (BELGIUM), 1887.

DEAR SIR: We beg to solicit your orders in iron beams and channels, which we can offer you at:

(Price quoted on application under rate of any competition.)
New York, Boston, Philadelphia duty paid. (Baltimore, New Orleans, or San Francisco.)

We make currently all sections of beams and channels usually required in America, and also up to 20 inches beams sections.

Prompt delivery is guaranteed from eight days to a fortnight after receipt of order, f. o. b. Antwerp.

Contracts are executed f. o. b. Antwerp, or c. i. f., duty paid, free on cars into the largest cities of United States of America.

All the irons are guaranteed to weigh within a few pounds of the weights that your architects require.

Tensile strength and quality guaranteed as good as the best American products.

Private cable-code sent on application, made in such a way as to enable you to stipulate orders in a few words.

We undertake to execute complete iron building, and any architectural work according to drawings; also bridge work.

Awaiting the favor of your order, which shall have our best attention,

We are, dear sirs, yours, obediently,

ANDRIS-JOCHAMS.

CHARLEROI, 14th March, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I beg you to take notice that we have appointed — as our sole and general agents in United States of America for the sale of our architectural iron, as per circular inclosed, and you will oblige us in addressing your demands to them in future.

With the prospect of a reduction in duties on architectural iron and steel in your country, we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us.

Messrs. Weir, Smith & Rogers intend to keep a large stock of our products always in hand, so that to be able to make at all times immediate deliveries.

We remain, dear sirs, with much respect, your obedient servants,

ANDRIS-JOCHAMS.

THE COMMITTEE BILL.

Having thus indicated my views of the principles which should govern tariff legislation, I now come to examine briefly the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It should be borne in mind that a number of the gentlemen composing the majority of the committee have served upon the committee in previous Congresses, have participated in the discussion and preparation of tariff measures, and have had special opportunity for becoming familiar with the facts and information presented to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury with regard to the ambiguities and inequalities of the existing tariff, the innumerable protests, appeals, and suits which have grown out of the faulty construction of its schedules and free-list, and the need of their thorough overhauling and revision, if for no other purpose than to cure the defects and remedy the evils in their construction. They should have been familiar, moreover, with the repeated recommendations for the adoption of specific duties made by the Secretary of the Treasury, as being necessary for the collection of the customs revenue with regularity, uniformity, and certainty.

Notwithstanding these facts, we have before us the bill of the committee, which is not in any proper sense a revision of the tariff, but consists of amendments constituting, I might say, a patch-work upon the existing law, perpetuating and multiplying its numerous infirmities of phraseology; its ambiguities and inequalities, which have perplexed

and vexed the executive officers in its administration, have been the subject of volumes of Treasury decisions year by year, and have embroiled the Government and merchants in untold litigation, making it necessary to create new courts for the special trial of custom cases, which are increasing in number month by month and involve unknown millions of demands upon the Government—a constant menace to the Treasury.

Not only have the committee ignored the recommendations of Secretaries Manning and Fairchild and of the customs officers at the various ports for the adoption of specific duties, but have actually, in a large number of cases, substituted ad valorem rates for existing specific duties, thus showing preference for a system which has been abandoned by all the civilized commercial nations on the globe, and which has been fitly characterized as a system under "which thieves prosper and honest traders are driven out of business."

A declared purpose of this bill is to secure "free raw materials, to stimulate manufactures." In execution of this idea the bill places on the free-list a large number of articles which are really articles of manufacture, such as salt, sawed and dressed lumber, laths and shingles, hackled and dressed flax, burlaps, machinery,terne or galvanized plates, glue, glycerine, soap, certain proprietary articles, extracts of hemlock, oils of various kinds, including hemp-seed and rape-seed, olive and fish oils, refined sulphur, various coal-tar preparations, earth paints, distilled oils, alkalies, and various other chemical compounds; various manufactured mineral substances, prepared china clay, quicksilver, bricks of all kinds except fire-brick, prepared meats, lime, plaster of Paris ground and calcined, various prepared drugs and chemicals, and many other articles of like character.

These constitute the products of large and useful industries throughout the United States, in which many millions of capital are invested and employing many thousands of working people.

At the same time the bill leaves or puts upon the dutiable lists such articles as lead ore, iron ore, zinc ores, nickel ore, and coal, which might be called raw materials, if that term can be properly applied to anything involving the expenditure of labor in its production. Further than this, the bill not only makes so-called "raw materials" free, such, for example, as flax, jute, hemp, hemp-seed and rape-seed, crude borax, opium, and hair of animals, but places on the free-list the manufactured products of these materials, namely, burlaps (for bagging, etc.), hemp-seed and rape-seed oil, boracic acid, codein and other salts and compounds of opium, and curled hair for mattresses, etc. [Applause.]

Thus the manufacture of such articles is made impossible in this country, except by reducing American labor to a worse condition than that of labor in Europe. It goes even farther, and places or leaves dutiable certain so-called raw materials, as, for example, iron ore, lead, coal, paper, paints, caustic soda and other alkalies, and sulphate of ammonia, while placing on the free-list articles made from these materials, such as hoop-iron and cotton-ties, iron or steel sheets or plates or taggers iron coated with tin or lead, known as tin-plates,terne-plates, and taggers tin, sulphate of iron or copperas, machinery, books and pamphlets, paintings, soap, and alum. In other words, the bill leaves or makes dutiable the raw material and puts on the free-list the article manufactured from it, thus not only placing an insurmountable barrier in the way of making such articles here, but actually protecting the foreign manufacturer and laborer against our own, and imposing for their benefit a burden upon the consumer in this country. [Applause.]

Again, the bill places lower rates on some manufactured articles than on the materials used in making them, as for instance: Manufactures of paper, 15 per cent.; and the paper to produce it at 25 per cent.

The paint known as orange mineral, 1½ cents per pound; white lead, from which it is made, 2 cents per pound.

Type metal, 15 per cent.; pig-lead, from which it is made, 1½ cents per pound, equal to 44 per cent.

Axminster and all other carpets 30 per cent.; yarns used in their manufacture, 40 per cent.

It leaves an internal-revenue tax of more than 300 per cent. on alcohol used in the arts, amounting, according to a fair estimate, to as much as the entire amount of duty collected on raw wool, which alcohol enters as a material in a vast number of important and needful articles, which the committee have either made free or have so reduced the rates thereon that the duty would be less than the tax on the alcohol consumed in their manufacture.

In some cases the difference between the duty imposed by the bill on the so-called raw materials and the articles made from them is so small as to destroy these industries, except upon the condition of leveling the wages of home labor to that of Europe.

For example, the difference between the duty proposed on pig-lead and that proposed on litharge and red lead, which are made from pig-lead, is only one-fourth of a cent per pound.

The difference between the duty on pig iron and that on steel blooms is only \$2 per ton; between steel blooms and steel rails but \$3 per ton; and between blooms and wire-rods less than \$3 per ton, coupled with the free admission of hoop-iron, cotton-ties, and sheet-iron in the form of galvanized and coated plates.

It is plain that such legislation would leave the ore in the mines, the pig-lead at the smelting works, the pig-iron to rust at the furnaces, while foreigners would supply our markets with these manufactured products.

In a large number of articles throughout the schedules, not already named, the reductions proposed by the bill are so large that the effect must be to destroy or restrict home production and increase enormously foreign importations, thus largely increasing customs revenue instead of reducing it, as claimed by the advocates of this bill. I mention particularly the following: Earthen and china ware, common window and plate glass and glass bottles, leaf-tobacco, manufactures of cotton, manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, and other fibers, carpets, fancy-goods, brushes, leather gloves, manufactures of India rubber, clay pipes, and other pipes.

It is claimed by the committee that the bill will reduce the customs revenue about \$54,000,000. On the contrary, I assert that it is fair to estimate that its effect would be to largely increase the revenue instead of reducing it; while the amount of material wealth it would destroy is incalculable.

Those supporting the bill hold themselves out as the champions of the farmer, while they take from him the protection duties on his wool, hemp, flax, flax-seed, meats, milk, fruits, vegetables, and seeds. And what do they give him in return?

They profess to give the manufacturer better rates than they now have. If this be so, how is the farmer to be benefited, or where does he get his compensation for the loss of his protective duties?

Much has been said about removing taxes upon "necessaries" and imposing them upon "luxuries." What does this bill propose to do in that direction?

It gives free olive-oil to the epicure, and taxes castor-oil 97 per cent.; it gives free tin-plate to the Standard Oil Company and to the great meat-canning monopolies, and imposes a duty of 100 per cent. on rice; it gives the sugar trust free bone-black, and proposes prohibitory duties on grocery grades of sugar; it gives free licorice to the tobacco manufacturer, while retaining prohibitive duties on manufactured tobacco; it imposes a duty of 40 per cent. on the "poor man's blanket," and only 30 per cent. on the Axminster carpet of the rich. It admits free of duty the fine animals imported by the gentlemen of the turf, and makes free the paintings and statuary of the railway millionaire and coal baron. [Great applause.]

I forbear further criticism of this singular measure, for enough has been said to show that my objections to it are not only to the rates imposed on many articles, but to the theory generally on which it has been constructed.

I yield to no man on this side of the House in my desire for continued Democratic control in the administration of the Federal Government. I do not believe the adoption of the committee's bill will make such result certain. I can not be coerced into any particular action upon economic questions by the direction of party caucus. The period of the political caucus has departed, never to return, and yet we should confer and have unity, if it is possible. In these matters I speak only for myself. My convictions on the tariff are strong, and founded, as I think, upon principle, and upon information and intelligent comprehension of the subject. When any one here enters upon the task of invoking caucus power or other modes of coercion, I can only say to him, if he acts with good purpose, that it will prove a fruitless undertaking; or if with ill motive, then I assign him to all the natural contempt which such self-constituted superciliousness deserves. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the question of affording protection to American industries is not a new one. It was the question uppermost in the colonies when our Government was founded. It contributed, perhaps, more than any other consideration to the adoption of the Constitution by the States. It has continued a question in every Congress from that day to this, and it will not die with this Congress nor this generation. It will continue as long as industries exist and our Government requires revenue. But I speak, I believe, with the sanction of the very highest authority when I say that for the first forty years of the existence of our Government there was no question as to the right of Congress to protect and encourage American manufactures by the exercise of the taxing power, or, in the language of Madison, "encouraging by duties * * * the manufactures and products of the country." That this was the policy, too, of every administration, and particularly of every Democratic administration, from Jefferson to Van Buren, is among the incontrovertible facts of our history. Jefferson favored such a policy. In his letter to Colonel Humphreys, January 20, 1809, he says:

My idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material.

And again, in his letter to Mr. Leiper, January 21, of the same year, he says:

I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our consumption, at least.

Again, in his letter to Governor Jay, he says:

An equilibrium of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is certainly become essential to our independence. Manufactures sufficient for our own consumption, of what we raise the raw materials, and no more; commerce sufficient to carry the surplus produce of agriculture, beyond our own consumption, to a market for exchanging for articles we can not raise, and no more. These are

the true limits of manufactures and commerce. To go beyond them is to increase our dependence on foreign nations and our liability to war.

Other quotations might be made to show the interest of the founder of the Democracy in American manufactures and his concurrence in the prevalent opinion that it was legitimately within the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution to so levy duties as to protect and encourage home industries. But as to the constitutional powers of Congress over this subject, none will dispute the high authority of Madison, who, above all others, as said Webster, was most competent to judge of the intentions of the makers of that instrument; but I wish to say for myself, before reading what I am about to present as coming from this authority, that I have never found it necessary or proper, for the justification of my own course, to claim more than such protection as incidentally might come from properly adjusted duties on imports. But that the doctrine that duties might under the Constitution be imposed as a means of regulating trade, passed unquestioned by the framers of the Constitution, who afterwards participated in the legislation of Congress on this subject, will hardly be disputed. But on this point hear what Madison himself says. In his letter to Mr. Cabell as late as 1828, he enters into an elaborate discussion of this question from which I extract the following:

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 restriction and prohibition, the manufactures and products of the country.

And then he goes on:

If Congress have not the power, it is annihilated for the nation; a policy without example in any other nation and not within the reason of the solitary one in our own.

And further on in the same letter:

If revenue be the sole object of a legitimate impost and the encouragement of domestic articles be not within the power of regulating trade, it would follow that no monopolizing or unequal regulations with foreign nations could be counteracted; that neither staple articles of subsistence nor the essential implements for the public safety could, under any circumstances, be insured or fostered at home by regulations of commerce, the usual and most convenient mode of providing for both.

And in his closing argument he adds these convincing conclusions:

That the encouragement of manufactures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the first Congress under the Constitution, when among the members present were so many who had been members of the Federal convention which framed the Constitution, and of the State convention which ratified it, each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form. It does not appear from the printed proceedings of Congress on that occasion that the power was denied by any of them. And it may be remarked that members from Virginia in particular, as well of the Anti-Federal as the Federal party, the names then distinguishing those who had opposed and those who had approved the Constitution, did not hesitate to propose duties and to suggest even prohibitions in favor of several articles of her production. By one a duty was proposed on mineral coal, in favor of the Virginia coal-pits; by another, a duty on hemp was proposed, to encourage the growth of that article; and by a third, a prohibition even of foreign beef was suggested, as a measure of sound policy.

A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade—an evidence that ought of itself to settle the question—is the uniform and practical sanction given to the power by the General Government for nearly forty years, with a concurrence or acquiescence of every State government throughout the same period, and, it may be added, through all the vicissitudes of party which marked the period. No novel construction, however ingeniously devised or however respectable and patriotic its patrons, can withstand the weight of such authorities or the unbroken current of so prolonged and universal a practice.

* * * And may it not be fairly left to the unbiased judgment of all men of experience and of intelligence to decide which is most to be relied on for a sound and safe test of the meaning of the Constitution, a uniform interpretation by all the successive authorities under it, commencing with its birth, and continued for a long period through the varied state of political contests, or the opinion of every new legislature, heated as it may be by the strife of parties, or warped, as often happens, by the eager pursuit of some favorite object, or carried away, possibly, by the powerful eloquence or captivating address of a few popular statesmen, themselves perhaps influenced by the same misleading causes? If the latter test is to prevail, every new legislative opinion might make a new constitution as the foot of every new chancellor would make a new standard of measure.

Monroe continuously, in all his messages, recommended protection and encouragement of American industries; and in his special message of May 4, 1822, he said:

Duties and imposts have always been light, not greater perhaps than would have been imposed for the encouragement of our manufactures had there been no occasion for the revenue arising from them; and taxes and excises have never been laid except in cases of necessity, and repealed as soon as the necessity ceased.

I call the attention of gentlemen, Democrats of the later school, to this language:

Duties * * * not greater perhaps than would have been imposed for the encouragement of our manufactures, had there been no occasion for the revenue arising from them.

In his second annual message Jackson presents in clear language views in conformity with those who preceded him:

Among the numerous causes of congratulation the condition of our impost revenue deserves special mention, inasmuch as it promises the means of extinguishing the public debt sooner than was anticipated and furnishes a strong illustration of the practical effects of the present tariff upon our commercial interests. The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional; and it is considered by almost all as defective in many of its parts.

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely incidental to that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States

have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them, and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case. This indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

And he adds:

In this conclusion, I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

I quote also on this point one who, though not a Democrat, on constitutional questions may be always listened to—Webster. While this question was before the country in 1844, he said:

I consider it as capable of mathematical demonstration as any proposition in Euclid, that the power of discriminating in custom-house duties for the protection of American labor and industry was understood, not by some but by all, by high and low everywhere, as included in the regulation of trade.

I am aware that about this period another doctrine and another set of ideas, under the leadership of Mr. Calhoun, more in consonance with the institution of slavery which then existed, began to take root in the South, and later to exert its unhealthy influence on the policy of the Government. I do not propose, however, here to traverse the history of this contest and the conflict between the industrial institutions of the two sections of the country, or the results of that conflict. But the new doctrine did not change the opinion of Jackson, nor swerve him from his settled purpose. For thirty years the contest between these two ideas went on. The tariffs of 1842 and 1846 marked the supremacy for the time being of the different views. And I stop here to note that the Democrats from Pennsylvania in the Senate and House of Representatives all voted, I believe, for the tariff of 1842, and all against the tariff of 1846, except Mr. Wilmot.

What would have been the destiny of our Republic had these ideas, with the condition of things of which they were the outgrowth, prevailed I leave to other imaginations. Happily, as I believe, for the whole country, the ideas and the doctrines of those who founded our Government and organized our institutions prevailed instead. Under these ideas our industrial system was founded with the establishment of the Constitution of 1789. The first Congress, in the first act imposing duties, declared that they were laid, among other purposes, "for the encouragement of manufactures." Here was the beginning of that system which has had such a marvelous growth and under which the accumulation of wealth has exceeded in a hundred years that of any other nation on the earth. It is that system I would perpetuate. If Jackson could say he was confirmed in the opinions I have quoted from him, by the opinions of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, how much more am I confirmed in my opinions by his great authority added to that of the founders and builders of the Democratic party?

I warn the party that it is not safe to abandon principles so fundamental to our institutions and so necessary to the maintenance of our industrial system, principles which attest the wisdom of those who established them by the fruits they have born, the full fruition of which, however, can only be realized in the extension of diversified industries to all parts of the country, not in the North and East alone, but in the South and West as well.

A new era of industrial enterprise has already dawned upon the South. No section of the country possesses greater natural advantages than the South, with her genial climate, her limitless raw materials, her mines of coal and iron, with abundant labor ready to develop them. Considering what has been there achieved in a single decade, what may not a century bring forth for her under a system calculated to favor the highest industrial development? When I read the history of my country and consider the past and present, and reflect on what is before us, I can not believe that the ideas that went down in the convulsions of 1861 will ever again dominate the destinies of this Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

When the chairman announced that Mr. RANDALL's hour had expired,

Mr. BIGGS said: I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted to go on.

Mr. MILLS. I must object. [Cries of "Oh, no!" and "Withdraw the objection."] I can not consent to throw back toward the close of the day gentlemen who are yet to speak. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was to speak at 10 o'clock.

A MEMBER on the Republican side (to Mr. MILLS). We gave Mr. COX two hours yesterday. Why did you not object then?

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the zeal of you gentlemen of the Republican party; but it was not a proper thing to do. This time has been divided.

Mr. RANDALL. I yielded the hour which I was to have from 10 to 11 to-day.

Mr. McKINLEY. I believe I am to be recognized next after the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I yield him fifteen minutes of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDALL. I did not hear the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has yielded the gentleman from Pennsylvania fifteen minutes of his time.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio has yielded a portion of his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. He has.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think it proper, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Ohio, to make a statement which I think I can afford to make— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. COX. I think it is only decorous and kind that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be extended. [Applause, mingled with cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I believe it due to all of us that I should say—and I think I can afford to say it, as I have asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to withdraw his objection—that the facts in regard to the occupation of the time to-day were these: It was understood that the gentleman from Ohio and myself were to have so much of the beginning of this day as might be needed; it was the understanding in the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides that the gentleman from Ohio was to commence at 11 o'clock and to speak so long as he might desire to speak; that I was to answer him and should have my time extended.

That was the distinct agreement between the gentleman from Ohio and myself, not personally, but as members of the committee selected by our respective sides to close the debate, with the exception of the remarks which may be made to-morrow by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and my colleague [Mr. CARLISLE], the honored Speaker of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] approached me the other day, stating that he was sick and would not be able to speak until to-day, and he asked me to consent that to-day the House should meet at 10 o'clock, and that he should speak from 10 till 11. I said that was a matter as to which I could not answer except with the concurrence of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Ohio, and myself had a friendly colloquy which ended in an agreement made by us, subject, of course, to the ratification of the House, that to-day the House should meet at 10 o'clock; that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should occupy the hour from 10 to 11; and that then the agreement which had been made by the Committee on Ways and Means as to the occupation of time by the gentleman from Ohio and myself should be carried out.

Mr. RANDALL. That is—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. One moment. Subsequently the gentleman from Ohio requested that the House should meet at 10 o'clock on the intervening days, Wednesday and Thursday, to which gentlemen of the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides agreed, and at their request I made the proposition to the House, and in pursuance of that arrangement we have been meeting at 10 o'clock. The understanding was that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should commence at 10 o'clock to-day and continue until 11; that the remainder of the day should be divided as I have indicated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, gave up the time from 10 until 11 this morning at the request of certain persons, and I have no doubt properly—

Mr. RANDALL. A gentleman got the floor last evening. I was here at 10 o'clock to-day ready to take the floor.

A MEMBER. The arrangement made last night was in open House.

Mr. MILLS. They had no right to make that arrangement.

Mr. RANDALL. I should have been through with my remarks by this time if I had been allowed to proceed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. When I came here this morning I was informed of that change in the programme, with which I had nothing to do, but to which I immediately gave cordial assent, feeling that whatever was agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Ohio, and the House, would be entirely agreeable to me. But when I informed the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—

Many MEMBERS. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa (to Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky). Have you any proposition to make?

Mr. RANDALL. If I had been allowed to go on I should have concluded by this time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. My reason for making this explanation is this—

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think this is the regular order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has yielded for a moment.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLIKEN. He has no time to yield.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I desire to make—

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let us hear the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I desire to make—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until order is restored.

Mr. PAYSON (after a pause). Mr. Chairman, what is the regular order?

Mr. KELLEY. To hear a proposition which is about to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is general debate on this bill.

Mr. PAYSON. Who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor, having had fifteen minutes yielded to him by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to make a proposition whereby I shall not encroach upon the kindness of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I was going to make was in order to relieve the gentleman from Ohio, because when he gives the fifteen minutes he proposes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and objection is made that he shall consume more than an hour in the discussion of this question, it will of necessity place him and the House in a most uncomfortable attitude when he takes the floor in his own right. My proposition is that the gentleman from Ohio, who has yielded his time, take it back, and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania shall have such time as he may desire to conclude his remarks, it being understood that the time so occupied shall come equally out of the time allotted to the gentleman from Ohio and my own time when I shall follow him. [Cries of "That's right!" and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

Mr. MCKINLEY was recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Before the gentleman from Ohio proceeds I desire to ask unanimous consent that he, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who follows him, may be permitted to occupy unlimited time in the discussion—the same courtesy which has been extended to other gentlemen on the committee.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, our country is in an anomalous situation. There is nothing resembling it anywhere else in the world. While we are seeking to find objects to relieve from taxation, in order that we may relieve an overflowing Treasury, other nations are engaged in exploring the field of human production to find new objects of taxation to supply their insufficient revenues. In considering the situation that thus confronts us, and the bill that is presented here as intended to relieve it, it is well that we should understand at the beginning the things upon which all are agreed.

They are, first, that we are collecting more money than is required for the current needs of the Government; and second, that the excess, whatever it may be, beyond the wants of the Government should be left with the people. Our contention, therefore, is upon the manner of the reduction and not upon the reduction itself; not that no reduction shall or ought to be made, but how and upon what principle can it best be accomplished. We agree, further, that the tax upon tobacco shall be removed and thus leave with the people \$30,000,000 which they annually pay upon this domestic product. Were we men of business, governed by the principles which guide practical men of affairs, this burden would have been and could have been removed any time within the past two years, and if removed two years ago no surplus would now vex the Administration or alarm the business of the country. In passing, it is suitable that I should say that within the period named no hindrance from this side of the House would have been interposed to the abolition of this tax.

It is also suitable that I should say, for the sake of the truth of history, that gentlemen on this side and gentlemen on the other side of the House repeatedly made efforts during the last Congress to secure recognition for the purpose of offering a bill to abolish this tax, which request was refused by the presiding officer of the House, and refused, too, Mr. Chairman, when every intelligent representative on this floor knew that if an opportunity was given to vote upon a bill for the abolition of that tax it would have received not simply a majority, but the vote of fully two-thirds of the House. I repeat that if that had been done, if the House as then organized had given to the representatives of the people an opportunity to vote upon a simple proposition to reduce taxation, no immediate surplus would be now in the Treasury to interrupt and disturb the business of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But this tax was not abolished, and if done now still leaves about forty millions of revenue collected in excess of the public necessity. How can this amount be remitted with the least disturbance to the business and employments of the people?

This, Mr. Chairman, is the real, the practical question. At this point parties and individuals differ, and herein the two lines of political thought which have prevailed from the formation of the Government are clearly

manifested, and present for consideration and the ultimate judgment of the people the division between the Republican and Democratic parties upon a purely economic question. I can not forbear, in this connection, to congratulate the country that upon this question our fellow-citizens of all sections and all nationalities, without regard to past party affiliations, unbiased by prejudice, and uninfluenced by passion, can divide. Here is presented an issue which leaves the past behind and looks only to the present and the future, an issue without a tinge or touch of sectionalism, which awakens none of the bitter memories of former discord or divisions, which appeals neither to race nor geographical lines, which knows no North, or South, or East, or West, but brings all within its sweep and contemplation, each dividing upon what each may honestly regard for the best interests and highest welfare of all; an issue which we can consider and discuss calmly and deliberately, having only in view the future of the individual citizen and the highest and best destiny of the Republic. In this spirit I welcome the issue so sharply, and I may say boldly, made by the President in his annual message and now further made by the bill under debate, and approach its consideration with the single purpose to reach if possible a conclusion which shall bring to the country and the whole country, with whose interests we are temporarily intrusted, the widest benefits and the most lasting good. [Applause.]

It will be freely confessed by our political opponents that this bill is but the beginning of a tariff policy marked out by the President, and is a partial response only to his message, to be followed up with additional legislation until our system of taxation shall be brought back to the ancient landmarks of the Democratic party, to a purely revenue basis; that is, that the tariff or duty put upon foreign importations shall hereafter look to revenue and revenue only, and discard all other considerations.

WHAT IS REVENUE TARIFF?

This brings us face to face, therefore, with the two opposing systems, that of a revenue as distinguished from a protective tariff, and upon their respective merits they must stand or fall. Now, what are they? First, what is a revenue tariff? Upon what principle does it rest? It is a tariff or tax placed upon such articles of foreign production imported here as will produce the largest revenue with the smallest tax; or, as Robert J. Walker, late Secretary of the Treasury and author of the tariff of 1846, from whom the advocates of the measure draw their inspiration, put it:

The only true maxim is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty, and that no duty be imposed upon any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue. The revenue (said Mr. Walker), from ad valorem duties last year (1845) exceeded that realized from specific duties, although the average of the ad valorem duties was only 23.57 per cent, and the average of the specific duties 41.30 per cent., presenting another strong proof that the lower duties increase the revenue.

To secure larger revenue from lower duties necessitates largely increased importations, and if these compete with domestic products the latter must be diminished or find other and distant and I may say impossible markets or get out of the way altogether. A genuine revenue tariff imposes no tax upon foreign importations the like of which are produced at home, or, if produced at home, in quantities not capable of supplying the home consumption, in which case it may be truthfully said the tax is added to the foreign cost and is paid by the consumer.

A revenue tariff seeks out those articles which domestic production can not supply, or only inadequately supply, and which the wants of our people demand, and imposes the duty upon them, and permits as far as possible the competing foreign product to be imported free of duty. This principle is made conspicuous in the bill under consideration; for example, wool, a competing foreign product, which our own flock-masters can fully supply for domestic wants, is put upon the free-list, while sugar, with a home product of only one-eleventh of the home consumption, is left dutiable.

Any tax levied upon a foreign product which is a necessity to our people, and which we can not fully supply, will produce revenue in amount only measured by our necessities and ability to buy. In a word, foreign productions not competing with home productions are the proper subjects for taxation under a revenue tariff, and in case these do not furnish the requisite revenue a low duty is put upon the foreign product competing with the domestic one—low enough to encourage and stimulate importations, and low enough to break down eventually domestic competition. For example, the duty proposed under this bill upon cotton bagging will extinguish the industry here, and under its provisions we would import all of that product from Calcutta and Dundee. A large revenue would come from this source, because the foreign would take the place of the domestic production. This duty is a revenue one, and gives no protection whatever to the home producer. If it did it would not be a revenue tariff. As the Cobden school of political science puts it, "The moment it is made clear that a tax is a benefit to home producers then the free-trade dogma condemns it. The test is simple and easy of application. Free-trade or a revenue tariff does not allow any import duties being imposed on such articles as are likewise produced at home." Or if produced at home a revenue tariff would soon destroy their production.

WHAT IS A PROTECTIVE TARIFF?

What is a protective tariff? It is a tariff upon foreign imports so adjusted as to secure the necessary revenue, and judiciously imposed upon those foreign products the like of which are produced at home or the like of which we are capable of producing at home. [Applause.] It imposes the duty upon the competing foreign product; it makes it bear the burden or duty, and, as far as possible, luxuries only excepted, permits the non-competing foreign product to come in free of duty. Articles of common use, comfort, and necessity which we can not produce here it sends to the people untaxed and free from custom-house exactions. [Applause.] Tea, coffee, spices, and drugs are such articles, and under our system are upon the free-list. It says to our foreign competitor, if you want to bring your merchandise here, your farm products here, your coal and iron ore, your wool, your salt, your pottery, your glass, your cottons and woollens, and sell alongside of our producers in our markets, we will make your product bear a duty; in effect, pay for the privilege of doing it. [Applause on the Republican side.] Our kind of a tariff makes the competing foreign article carry the burden, draw the load, supply the revenue; and in performing this essential office it encourages at the same time our own industries and protects our own people in their chosen employments. [Applause.] That is the mission and purpose of a protective tariff. That is what we mean to maintain, and any measure which will destroy it we shall firmly resist, and if beaten on this floor we will appeal from your decision to the people, before whom parties and policies must at last be tried. [Applause.] We have free trade among ourselves throughout thirty-eight States and the Territories and among sixty millions of people. Absolute freedom of exchange within our own borders and among our own citizens is the law of the Republic. Reasonable taxation and restraint upon those without is the dictate of enlightened patriotism and the doctrine of the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.] Free trade in the United States is founded upon a community of equalities and reciprocities. It is like the unrestrained freedom and reciprocal relations and obligations of a family. Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one nation, one destiny. It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny. We deny to those foreign nations free trade with us upon equal terms with our own producers. [Applause.] The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties; is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and glory of the nation. Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our producers, our labor, and our tax-payers? Let the gentleman who follows me answer. [Applause.] We put a burden upon his productions, we discriminate against his merchandise, because he is alien to us and our interests, and we do it to protect our own, defend our own, preserve our own, who are always with us in adversity and prosperity, in sympathy and purpose, and, if necessary, in sacrifice. [Applause.] That is the principle which governs us. I submit it is a patriotic and righteous one. In our own country, each citizen competing with the other in free and unresentful rivalry, while with the rest of the world all are united and together in resisting outside competition as we would foreign interference.

Free foreign trade admits the foreigner to equal privileges with our own citizens. It invites the product of foreign cheap labor to this market in competition with the domestic product, representing higher and better paid labor. It results in giving our money, our manufactures, and our markets to other nations, to the injury of our labor, our tradespeople, and our farmers. Protection keeps money, markets, and manufactures at home for the benefit of our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is scarcely worth while to more than state the proposition that taxation upon a foreign competing product is more easily paid and less burdensome than taxation upon the non-competing product. In the latter it is always added to the foreign cost, and therefore paid by the consumer, while in the former, where the duty is upon the competing product, it is largely paid in the form of diminished profits to the foreign producer. [Applause.] It would be burdensome beyond endurance to collect our taxes from the products, professions, and labor of our own people.

THE BILL WILL NOT REDUCE THE REVENUE.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill ostensibly to reduce the revenue. It will not do it. Take from this bill its internal-revenue features, its reduction of twenty-four and a half million dollars from tobacco and from special licenses to dealers in spirits and tobacco, eliminate these from the bill and you will not secure a dollar of reduction to the Treasury under its operation. Your \$27,000,000 of proposed reduction by the free-list will be more than offset by the increased revenues which shall come from your lower duties; and I venture the prediction here to-day that if this bill should become a law, at the end of the fiscal year 1889 the dutiable list under it will carry more money into the Treasury

than is carried into the Treasury under the present law, because with every reduction of duties upon foreign imports you stimulate and increase foreign importations; and to the extent that you increase foreign importations, to that extent you increase the revenue.

THE INCONSISTENCIES OF THE BILL.

There is another singular thing in connection with this bill, and I have nowhere seen attention called to it. Now I do not intend to examine the bill item by item. The minority of the Committee on Ways and Means (whose views, on behalf of my political associates I presented) went sufficiently over the bill in detail. But there are a few striking things in the bill which the country ought to understand. No one would have supposed from hearing this discussion but that the bill reduced duties all along the line. You never would have suspected, had you listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], or other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, that this bill increased duties, would you? How many men on the other side of the House know what is in this bill to-day? I would like to poll them. [Laughter.]

Now, here is a single item, steel billets. The present duty on steel billets is 45 per cent. ad valorem. In this bill it is increased to \$11 per ton, which is equivalent to 68.33 per cent.—an advance of 45 per cent. Do you know what is made out of these steel billets? Wire fencing, which incloses the great fields of the West; and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. by this bill; and if the principle of the gentlemen who advocate the bill be true, that the duty is added to the cost, every pound of wire fencing that goes to the West will be increased from one-quarter to one-half a cent a pound; all this under a Democratic bill. What else is made out of steel billets? Nails, which everybody uses, which enter into the every-day uses of the people. The duty upon nails is reduced 25 per cent., and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. [Laughter.] As a friend near me suggests, when one end goes up the other goes down; and the latter, I trust, will be the fate of this bill. [Laughter.]

Why, sir, the duty on wire fencing is only 45 per cent. ad valorem; yet the billet from which wire fencing is made must pay in this bill 63 per cent. Here [illustrating] is a piece of wire rod drawn from these steel billets, and which finally goes into fencing. That is dutiable at 45 per cent. under this bill; and the steel from which it is made is dutiable at 63 per cent. What do you think of "raw material for manufactures?" [Laughter.] No account is here taken of the labor required to draw the rods.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all which is remarkable about this bill, this great bill which is based upon principle, it is said, which the President stands behind and beneath, and which he insists shall be passed, whether or no, in this House, and for the passage of which he is dispensing official favors; for, as the Post, of this city, says, "there is an Allentown for every SOWDEN." [Laughter and applause.]

What else? Here, for example, are cotton-ties; which present another queer freak in this bill. Everybody knows what cotton-ties are; they are hoop-iron cut into lengths just large enough to go round a bale of cotton. Now, if the Southern cotton-planter wants some of this hoop-iron with which to bale his cotton, he goes to the custom-house at New York or Charleston and cuts off all he wants; and he does not have to pay a cent of duty; but if the farmer-constituent of my friend whosits before me [Mr. NELSON], or your farmer-constituent, wants some hoop-iron of precisely the same width and thickness, and goes to the custom-house to get it, the Government makes it pay one cent and a half of duty upon every pound he takes, while it lets the cotton-planter take his for nothing. If the Western farmer wants it for his bucket or his barrel or to go on his wagon-bed, or if the washerwoman wants it for her washtub, every one of these must pay a cent and a half a pound, under the philosophy of the gentlemen who framed this bill, while the cotton-planter gets his absolutely free of duty.

Gentlemen, is that fair? I appeal to Southern men who sit before me; I appeal to Northern Democrats who sit around me; is that fair upon any principle of justice or fair play? Talk about sectionalism! You raise the question in your bill; you make a sectional issue which I deeply regret, and I am sure you must upon serious reflection.

There are some other features in this bill which are a little singular. The proposed duty on white lead is 2 cents a pound, while orange mineral, which is made from white lead, is reduced to one cent and a half a pound. [Laughter.] That is another case of high duty upon raw material and low duty upon the finished product.

Why, what in the world, Mr. Chairman, has this bill done for the people anyhow? What has it done for the farmer? It has taken the duty practically off of everything he grows; I will not stop to give the items. It makes free practically every product of the farm, the forest, and mine.

It takes the duty off of wool. What does it give the grower in return? Does it give him anything free? Everything he buys is dutiable. The coat he wears, the hat that covers his head, his shoes, his stockings, his sugar, his rice, everything bears a duty and substantially everything he raises put on the free-list.

The duty on wool must go. What has this Democratic party given the agriculturists in return for this slaughter of their interests? I

have looked this bill up and down, and I will tell you what they have done for the farmer. They have given him free sheep-dip. [Laughter and applause.] Sheep-dip is made free and the duty is released. My distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. LEE], who honors me with his presence here, knows what this article is. It is a preparation which is used on sheep. It is made up largely of the stems of tobacco. It has got a little sulphur in it, I believe; it has got a little lime in it. They put that on the free-list, and that is all they do for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. What good is that to the farmer after they have destroyed his flocks?

Mr. MCKINLEY. None. They leave the shears he clips his wool with at 45 per cent. ad valorem. They make his wool free and make the farmer pay 45 per cent. for the shears with which he clips his wool. [Laughter.]

But that is not all. The bell, the sheep bell—if my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] is here, if that golden-shod shepherd from Worcester is here [laughter and applause], he will understand. It is the bell that is put around the neck of the sheep to admonish the shepherd of the whereabouts of the wandering flock under his charge. I am told the gentleman has got on the outside. I learn now he is here in his seat; I am glad to see him. He knows what I am talking about. [Laughter.]

They have left them dutiable at 45 per cent. ad valorem. Why, the sheep even will be ashamed of you, gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Tin plates are made free. What are tin plates made of? Ninety-seven and a half per cent. are sheet-iron or sheet-steel; 2½ per cent. tin. Tin plates are made free. Sheet-iron, sheet-steel are dutiable at 2 cents a pound. Now, I shall not tax you further with the details of the bill. I might spend hours in pointing out like inconsistencies. I will leave their further discussion for the five-minute debate. I only give these samples so that my honorable and learned friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] who replies to me, shall take them up and explain the principle on which these rates are fixed and these duties levied.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing which I wish to call attention to in connection with this bill, and that is the internal-revenue part of it. It seems to have escaped attention. Now, so far as the abolition of the tax on tobacco is concerned we are all in accord; but this new feature of the bill provides for the repeal of the law which authorizes the destruction of illicit stills when found in unlawful use. Under the present law if you find a man engaged in unlawful distilling, not having paid the tax or secured the license, the officer is authorized to go and destroy the whole outfit. This bill repeals that section of the law and provides that the still shall neither be mutilated nor destroyed, but preserved presumably for future violations of the law. [Laughter and applause.]

And in this bill further provision is made that in case a man is arrested for illicit distilling, the judge is charged especially with the duty of looking well to his comfort and to his well-being while he is in the custody of the officials of the law. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

That provision does not apply to any other class of criminals under any of our statutes; but if a man is engaged in violating the revenue laws he must be tenderly looked after by the judge, who is directed to see that he is in every way made comfortable while serving out his sentence in prison. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

THE VICIOUS AD VALOREM SYSTEM INTRODUCED IN BILL.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one leading feature of this bill, which is not by any means the most objectionable feature, but which, if it stood alone, ought to defeat this entire measure; and that is the introduction of the ad valorem system of assessment to take the place of the specific system now generally in force. You all know the difference between the ad valorem system and the specific mode of levying duties. One is based upon value, the other upon quantity. One is based upon the foreign value, difficult of ascertainment, resting in the judgment of experts, all the time offering a bribe to undervaluation; the other rests upon quantity, fixed and well known the world over, always determinable and always uniform. The one is assessed by the yard-stick, the ton, and the pound-weight of commerce, and the other is assessed by the foreign value, fixed by the foreign importer or his agent in New York or elsewhere; fixed by the producer, fixed by anybody at any price to escape the payment of full duties. Why, the valuation under the ad valorem system is not even uniform throughout the United States.

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], who listens to me now, knows that the valuations fixed upon imported goods at the port of Boston are often different from the valuations fixed on the same class of goods, costing the same, arriving in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, or Charleston.

So we do not have and can not have a uniform value, for the value is subject always to the cupidity or dishonesty of the foreign importer or producer. It is a system, sir, that has been condemned by all the leading nations of the world. There is not a leading nation that adheres to any considerable extent to the ad valorem rates of duty upon articles imported into its borders; and England has abandoned all ad valorem

duties except one, for the very reason that there can be no honest administration of the revenue laws so long as the value is fixed thousands of miles away from the point of production and impossible of verification at home. Henry Clay said fifty years ago:

Let me fix the value of the foreign merchandise, and I do not care what your duty is.

Mr. Secretary Manning, in his very able report made to the last Congress, has gone over the entire question, and he publishes in a volume the opinions of the experts of the Treasury, the collectors, the naval officers, the special agents of the Department, all of them declaring that there is nothing left for the American Government to do but to abolish the ad valorem system and adopt the specific in the interest of the honest collection of the revenue and for the safety and security of reputable merchants. And the Secretary himself says in language too strong and plain to be misunderstood that it is the duty of Congress to abandon the ad valorem and establish specific duties.

I give below these opinions.

Naval officer Burt, of New York, says:

I have long been convinced that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would not only be a benefit to the revenues, but would go far to relieve their administration from the friction and inevitable injustice that have made it in a measure odious. I might give here a *résumé* of my reasons for this opinion, as frequently expressed officially hitherto, but I presume the Department is fully apprised of all the arguments adduced on either side. I will therefore simply say that the ad valorem system is theoretically the perfect system, and that this has engaged its support by those who have only had opportunity to view it as an abstract proposition. This prejudice in its favor must surely give way before the overwhelming evidences that in practice, particularly with high rates, it breeds injustice, contention, and commercial obstructions that are almost intolerable.

James D. Power, a special agent of the Treasury, in a report to the same Secretary, says:

Ad valorem rates of duty afford temptations and opportunities for fraud which can not be guarded against, even by the most rigid rules and vigilant watchfulness. The assessment of values under this system is based upon expert knowledge of values, the most uncertain and arbitrary method that could be devised. Under the ad valorem system fraud has prospered and demoralized the importing trade, which has passed from the hands of American citizens into the control of men who have taken advantage of our high import duties to enrich themselves at the expense of the revenue and the ruined trade of American wholesale firms. Fraud of this nature is difficult to detect and more difficult still to establish. In the absence of documentary proof it resolves itself into a mere difference of opinion between experts; and the owner of the suspected goods can at all times procure experts who will maintain the correctness of his invoice prices, or he may select an easier and more convincing and efficacious line of defense by procuring affidavits from his buyer or partner abroad to the effect that the invoice cost was the actual price paid for the goods.

Messrs. L. G. Martin and A. K. Tingle, special agents, make the following statement to the Secretary:

There can be no doubt that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would help to diminish the tendency to corrupt action and loss to the revenue by the incompetency or indifference of appraisers. The application of specific rates to all textile fabrics would undoubtedly be a work of great difficulty, particularly as to woolen goods, but it is believed that a schedule can be prepared by the skilled officers in the appraiser's department, with the aid of manufacturers and merchants, which would be satisfactory to all interested, except those who are profiting by the present system of undervaluation.

The late Secretary Manning sums up the objections to ad valorem rates, and I beg to quote his language. He exposes the vice of the system which this bill seeks to engraft upon our legislation:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously inherent in that system.

One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that, under the former, duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic. That would be partially true of an ad valorem system levied upon "home value;" but there are constitutional impediments in the way of such a system which appear to be insuperable. But under an ad valorem system, the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away, and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice. One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 or 30 per cent. undervaluation and temptation to undervaluation would disappear; but the records of this Department for the years 1817, 1840, and 1857 do not uphold that conclusion.

This one feature of the bill ought to be enough to insure its defeat, and if the party associates of the late Secretary had given heed to his sound utterances this vicious mode of assessment would have no place in the bill. Instead of simplifying the collection of the revenues as the title of the bill declares, it will increase the difficulties now experienced, encourage fraudulent invoices, promote undervaluation, impair the revenue, and do incalculable injury to honest importers and merchants.

THE GENERAL EFFECT OF PROTECTION.

I now come to consider the general effect of the protective system upon our people and their employments. There is no conflict of interests and should be none between the several classes of producers and the consumers in the United States. Their interests are one, interrelated and interdependent. That which benefits one benefits all; one man's work has relation with every other man's work in the same community; each is an essential part of the grand result to be attained, and that statesmanship which would seek to array the one against the other for any purpose is narrow, unworthy, and unpatriotic. The President's message is unhappily in that direction. The discussion had on

this floor has taken that turn. Both have been calculated to create antagonisms where none existed.

The farmer, the manufacturer, the laborer, the tradesman, and the producer and the consumer all have a common interest in the maintenance of a protective tariff. All are alike and equally favored by the system which you seek to overthrow. It is a national system, broad and universal in its application; if otherwise it should be abandoned. It can not be invoked for one section or one interest to the exclusion of others. It must be general in its application within the contemplation of the principle upon which the system is founded. We have been living under it for twenty-seven continuous years, and it can be asserted with confidence that no country in the world has achieved such industrial advancement, and such marvelous progress in arts, science, and civilization as ours. Tested by its results, it has surpassed all other revenue systems.

From 1789 to 1888, a period of ninety-nine years, there have been forty-seven years when a Democratic revenue-tariff policy has prevailed, and fifty-two years under the protective policy, and it is a noteworthy fact that the most progressive and prosperous periods of our history in every department of human effort and material development were during the fifty-two years when the protective party was in control and protective tariffs were maintained; and the most disastrous years—years of want and wretchedness, ruin and retrogression, eventuating in insufficient revenues and shattered credits, individual and national—were during the free-trade or revenue-tariff eras of our history. No man living who passed through any of the latter periods but would dread their return, and would flee from them as he would escape from fire and pestilence; and I believe the party which promotes their return will merit and receive popular condemnation. What is the trouble with our present condition? No country can point to greater prosperity or more enduring evidences of substantial progress among all the people. Too much money is being collected, it is said. We say stop it; not by indiscriminate and vicious legislation, but by simple business methods. Do it on simple, practical lines and we will help you. Buy up the bonds, objectionable as it may be, and pay the nation's debts, if you can not reduce taxation. You could have done this long ago. Nobody is chargeable for the failure and delay but your own Administration.

Who is objecting to our protective system? From what quarter does the complaint come? Not from the enterprising American citizen; not from the manufacturer; not from the laborer, whose wages it improves; not from the consumer, for he is fully satisfied, because under it he buys a cheaper and a better product than he did under the other system; not from the farmer, for he finds among the employes of the protected industries his best and most reliable customers; not from the merchant or the tradesman, for every hive of industry increases the number of his customers and enlarges the volume of his trade. Few, indeed, have been the petitions presented to this House asking for any reduction of duties upon imports. None, that I have seen or heard of, and I have watched with the deepest interest the number and character of these petitions that I might gather from them the drift of public sentiment—I say I have seen none asking for the passage of this bill, or for any such departure from the fiscal policy of the Government so long recognized and followed, while against this legislation there has been no limit to petitions, memorials, prayers, and protests, from producer and consumer alike.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR SUCH A MEASURE.

This measure is not called for by the people; it is not an American measure it is inspired by importers and foreign producers, most of them aliens, who want to diminish our trade and increase their own; who want to decrease our prosperity and augment theirs, and who have no interest in this country except what they can make out of it. To this is added the influence of the professors in some of our institutions of learning, who teach the science contained in books and not that of practical business. I would rather have my political economy founded upon the every-day experience of the puddler or the potter than the learning of the professor, the farmer and factory hand than the college faculty. Then there is another class who want protective tariffs overthrown. They are the men of independent wealth, with settled and steady incomes, who want everything cheap but currency; the value of everything clipped but coin—cheap labor but dear money. These are the elements which are arrayed against us.

Men whose capital is invested in productive enterprises, who take the risks of business, men who expend their capital and energy in the development of our resources, they are in favor of the maintenance of the protective system. The farmer, the rice-grower, the miner, the vast army of wage-earners from one end of the country to the other, the chief producers of wealth, men whose capital is their brain and muscle, who aspire to better their condition and elevate themselves and their fellows; the young man whose future is yet before him, and which he must carve out with his hand and head, who is without the aid of fortune or of a long ancestral line, these are our steadfast allies in this great contest for the preservation of the American system. Experience and results in our own country are our best advisers, and they vindicate beyond the possibility of dispute the worth and wisdom of the system.

What country can show such a trade as ours, such commerce, such immense transportation lines, such a volume of exchanges, and such

marvelous production from the raw material to the finished product. Its balance-sheet is without a parallel in the world's history—richest in agriculture, greatest in its domestic trade and traffic, and leading in manufactures any nation in Europe. Why abandon a policy which can point to such achievements and whose trophies are to be seen on every hand? The internal commerce of the United States is greater than the entire foreign commerce of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Holland, Belgium, and Austria-Hungary. Why, a single railroad system in this country (that of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company) carries more tonnage and traffic in a single year than all the merchant ships of Great Britain. The whole of Europe has not built as many miles of railroad as this country has during some recent years, and in 1880 the whole known world did not lay as many miles of track as were laid across this country. Great Britain's foreign commerce equals about one-sixth of our domestic commerce. Can we do better under any other fiscal policy? We say not. Wise statesmanship commands us, therefore, to let well enough alone.

Sir Edward Sullivan, in a recent article in the London Post, makes these suggestive comparisons, which I beg every gentleman to hear:

Under free trade the masses must get poorer, because they get less employment. A well-known statistical work gives a comparison of the material progress of France under protection and England under free trade. If there is any truth in figures it ought to startle us from our free-trade dream.

The comparison is based on the returns of legacy duty:

In 1826 England was 10s. a head richer than France.

In 1850 England was 19s. a head richer than France.

In 1877 England was 5s. a head poorer than France.

France has 57 per cent. of her land under tillage, and it is increasing every year.

The United Kingdom has 30 per cent. of land under tillage, and it is diminishing every year, but the population of England increases much more rapidly than the population of France.

The commerce of England has increased 21 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of France has increased 39 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of the United States has increased 63 per cent. in ten years.

The commerce of the world has increased 26 per cent. in ten years.

So much for the blasting effect of free trade.

In Germany, so long ago as the 14th of May, 1882, Bismarck, in a speech before the German Reichstag, paid to the Republican tariff high eulogy. He said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern time. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterward disbanded its Army, found employment for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

You may try protection by any test you will. You may try it not only by the condition of the individual citizen and his happiness and prosperity and the aggregate prosperity of the nation, but try it by the progress which has been made in invention and scientific development; try it by any standard you may raise, the protective system shows by its results that it surpasses any other. You can match it with no other.

Go to the Patent Office and examine the evidences furnished from that great register of the products of American genius. Take the States which have stood by the protective system, which have believed in it, which have been built up under it, and contrast them with the States whose Representatives have stood in unyielding opposition to the system on this floor. See what result you get. Take Connecticut, a little State, but a manufacturing one. In the year 1887 there were 788 patents granted to the inhabitants of that State, 1 for every 790 of its inhabitants, while for Arkansas the number of patents granted was 65, 1 for every 12,346. Take Massachusetts: In 1887 there were 1,875 patents granted to the people of that State, 1 to every 950 of her population, while to Kentucky there were 245 patents granted, or 1 to every 6,729 of her population. Take Illinois: 1,595 patents were granted to her people, 1 to every 1,929 of her population, while for Georgia there were 130, or 1 in every 11,862 of her population. Here is the list:

[From the Commissioner's report, 1887.]

States.	Patents.	One to every inhabitant.
Connecticut.....	788	790
Arkansas.....	65	12,346
Massachusetts.....	1,875	950
Illinois.....	1,595	1,929
Kentucky.....	245	6,729
Georgia.....	130	11,862
New Jersey.....	988	1,144
Louisiana.....	112	8,392
Mississippi.....	4,047	1,255
Ohio.....	45	25,146
North Carolina.....	1,477	2,165
Pennsylvania.....	66	21,208
South Carolina.....	2,109	2,630
Rhode Island.....	52	19,145
Tennessee.....	224	1,234
Vermont.....	121	12,746
Virginia.....	113	2,966
California.....	132	11,458
Texas.....	505	1,712
	265	6,006

These figures need no comment; they point their own moral; they enforce their own lesson. They demonstrate better than any argument that I can make that invention and progress and the general diffusion of knowledge follow manufacturing and industrial enterprises. [Applause.]

A HOME MARKET.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a furnace or factory or mill in any neighborhood has the effect at once to enhance the value of all property and all values for miles surrounding it. They produce increased activity. The farmer has a better and a nearer market for his products. The merchant, the butcher, the grocer, have an increased trade. The carpenter is in greater demand; he is called upon to build more houses. Every branch of trade, every avenue of labor, will feel almost immediately the energizing influence of a new industry. The truck farm is in demand; the perishable products, the fruits, the vegetables, which in many cases will not bear exportation and which a foreign market is too distant to be available, find a constant and ready demand at good paying prices.

What the agriculturist of this country wants more than anything else, after he has gathered his crop, are consumers, consumers at home, men who do not produce what they eat, who must purchase all they consume; men who are engaged in manufacturing, in mining, in cotton-spinning, in the potteries, and in the thousands of productive industries which command all their time and energy, and whose employments do not admit of their producing their own food.

The American agriculturist further wants these consumers near and convenient to his field of supply. Cheap as inland transportation is, every mile saved is money made. Every manufacturing establishment in the United States, wherever situated, is of priceless value to the farmers of the country. The six manufacturing States of New England aptly illustrate the great value of a home market to the Western farmer. These States have reached the highest perfection in skill and manufactures. They do not raise from their own soil, with the exceptions of hay and potatoes, but a small fraction of what their inhabitants require and consume; they could not from their own fields and granaries feed the population which they had in 1830, much less their present population. The most intense revenue-reformer, the most unenlightened Democrat, will have to confess that New England is indebted in large part for her splendid development to the protective system. Now, has her prosperity and progress been secured at the sacrifice of other interests and other sections? I answer no, but has brought, as I believe I shall be able to show, a positive blessing to all of our 60,000,000 of people.

In 1880 the population of these six States was over 4,000,000. The food products required by their people, the very necessities of their daily life in a large measure, came from other States and remote sections of the Union. They raised in 1880 but one-quarter of 1 per cent. of the total wheat production of the United States. They raised in the same year but one-half of 1 per cent. of the total crop of Indian corn, 2½ per cent. of the oats, 12 per cent. of the hay, and 13 per cent. of the potatoes which were produced in the United States. What did they consume? What did they buy of the Western farmer? Fifty millions of dollars' worth of meat were consumed by their industrial people in a single year. The extent of their needs is strikingly shown by the fact (obtained from the accounts of Commissioner Fink, that during the year 1884 "the trunk lines" brought into New England no less than 470,000 tons of flour and 950,000 tons of grain. At 200 pounds to the barrel of flour, this is an importation of 4,700,000 barrels, or one and one-fifth, nearly, for each inhabitant. During the same year there were exported from Boston and Portland, the only points in New England from which breadstuffs are sent abroad, 2,100,000 barrels of flour, leaving for consumption within these States 2,600,000 barrels. These figures take no account of the large trade by water from New York. I am informed that a large part of the flour consumed in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Southern Massachusetts is received in this way, but no reliable statistics are available. It is reasonable, however, to suppose, and this comes to me from what I deem good authority, that the amount thus received and consumed offsets a large portion of the foreign exports to which I have referred.

Of the grain received during the same year rather less than 400,000 tons were exported, leaving for New England consumption 550,000 tons, for all of which these States were the customers of the West in addition to the amount grown upon their own soil. In addition to this, New England consumed, in 1886-'87 in her factories nearly one-fourth of the entire cotton crop of the country. More than this, she used in her woolen mills in 1880 fully one-half of the entire wool clip of the United States, and during the year 1886 she consumed more than one-sixth of the entire anthracite-coal production of the country and 5½ per cent. of the bituminous-coal production, and every pound of both came from the Middle and Southern States.

Is not New England (I appeal to the gentlemen of the other side, I appeal to the farmers of the country) worth preserving? Is not the industrial system which makes such a community of consumers for agricultural products possible worth maintaining? Does not she furnish you a market worth fostering? Does not she give you a trade and an exchange of products worth your while to guard with the most considerate care? And does not her condition indicate the wisdom of

the policy we advocate? Is not her market better for you than a foreign one? Is not New England a better customer for you, more reliable, more easily reached, more stable, than Old England? [Applause on the Republican side.] Is not Boston a better consumer for the people of the United States than London, New York than Liverpool, Pittsburgh than Manchester, Cincinnati than Birmingham? [Applause on the Republican side.]

New England buys of you for all her wants; Old England takes not a pound or a bushel from you except what she must have and can not get elsewhere.

Now, let us contrast this home market of New England with the foreign market of Old England. In 1880 New England consumed 540,000,000 pounds of cotton, at 11.61 a pound, which in value then amounted to \$62,695,000, 20 per cent. greater than the per capita value of all our domestic exports to the United Kingdom, and this was only New England's contribution to the Southern producers of cotton. She sends at least \$70,000,000 to the West and Northwest for her food supplies. She sends to the wool-growers of the Middle, Western, and Pacific States \$40,000,000 annually for their fleeces. I repeat, is not this market worth preserving, ay, cherishing, and does it not make us long to have New England thrive, New England enterprise, and New England politics more generally distributed throughout all sections of the country? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can destroy this valuable home market by such legislation as is proposed in this bill; you can diminish this demand for food, for cotton, for wool, for flax, and hemp produced in other sections of the country by following the delusive theories of our friends on the other side of the House; you can diminish the capacity of the operatives to buy of you by diminishing their wages; you can drive them from the cotton and woolen factories to the farms; they will then drift to the West and Northwest, not to engage in manufacture, but in a great measure to become tillers of the soil, and instead of being as they are now, and as they will be under a proper tariff system, your consumers, they become your competitors. They go from the ranks of consumers to the ranks of producers; diminish the consumers and increase the producers. The foreign market for agricultural products is one of the delusions of free trade. If it ever had any real substance as against a good home market that has long since disappeared.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says to the Western farmer, "Let New England go. Pass her by and go to Old England." Well, that is about as practical as the Democratic party ordinarily is. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DUNN, a prominent member of this House and chairman of one of its leading committees, and I remember to have heard him say what I now read from the RECORD:

The wheat producer of the Northwest is standing face to face with the wheat producer of India. A few years ago India shipped 40,000 bushels of wheat. Last year (1885) she put into the market 40,000,000 bushels. Can you protect the Northwest farmer against that labor? India can put wheat down in the markets of consumption in Europe cheaper than we can transport it from the fields of production to the markets of consumption; that is to say, India can produce and market her wheat in Europe for what it costs the farmer of the Northwest to transport his to the market of consumption, without allowing him for the cost of production. In other words, the transportation of wheat costs the American farmer as much as both transportation and production cost the India farmer.

In the face of a statement like this, from such high Democratic authority, how, I ask, is the wheat of the American farmer to reach the European market with any profit to our producers? And yet it is to this kind of competition the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee invites the American farmer. Do the farmers want such a market with such a competition? What their answer will be no man can doubt. They reject with indignation and scorn the chairman's moria-tion. [Applause.] The home market is the best, besides being the safest. It has got the most money to spend, and spends the most. It consumes the most; it is therefore the most profitable.

The masses of our people live better than any people in the world. Great Britain only buys our food products when she has not enough of her own and can reach no other supply. This market, therefore, is fitful and fluctuating, and can not be relied upon as we can rely upon our own consumers. The foreign market under a revenue tariff for agricultural products has not been encouraging in our own experience in the past. It promises less under such a system in the future.

INCREASED IMPORTATIONS THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

The chairman of the committee in opening this debate boldly announced that we must increase foreign importations to secure national prosperity. How much does the gentleman and the party with which he is associated desire to increase importations? Are they not large enough already? Are they not now crowding our producers and diminishing their annual productions? Are they not already making labor restless, filling it with apprehension and uncertainty as to the future? Is this country to be the dumping ground of foreign products? During the last fiscal year over \$233,000,000 in value of foreign merchandise was imported into the United States free of duty, and over \$450,000,000 additional was imported which paid a duty. Is this not enough? Do the iron and steel workers want further importations in their line, representing cheap labor, to compete with the product of their labor? Over \$50,000,000 in value of iron and steel manufactures was imported last year, every dollar of which repre-

sented foreign capital and foreign labor, which might well have been produced at home. Every ton could have been made here, and American hands were waiting to make it.

How much labor do you suppose was represented by the \$50,000,000 worth of iron and steel that came into this country last year? It would have taken 1,740 puddlers and helpers, working every day for 300 days in the year, to have produced the scrap-iron that came from Europe last year. It would have taken 2,500 men 300 days to have produced the bar and structural iron, and steel billets, and slabs, and ingots which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 300 men 300 days, besides those engaged in preparing the raw material, to have produced the plates and sheets, the corrugated iron, and the steel in various forms imported last year. It would have taken 3,700 men 300 days to have made the wire rods and the nails and the screws and wire in various shapes which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 800 men 300 days to have made the washers, and the bolts, and the fish-plates, and railway-plates, the steel tire, hinge-iron, and tubes of steel which were imported into this country last year. It would have taken 500 men 300 days to have made the iron and steel rails which were brought into the United States from abroad last year. It would have taken 24,000 men to manufacture the tin-plate imported last year. Summing up these figures 33,540 men, working for 300 days, would have been required to produce the \$50,000,000 worth of iron and steel which we imported last year. Do you want that volume increased? Ten million sixty-two thousand is the aggregate number of days' work that were taken from American workingmen, every day's work of which they could have performed, and were waiting ready to perform. [Applause.] Including all branches of labor required to manufacture the fifty millions of imported iron and steel and the manufacture thereof, taking into account the labor employed in the mining, transportation, and manipulation of the raw materials, and it would employ nearly, if not quite, one hundred thousand men.

I do not know what you think about it; but I would not permit a single ton of steel to come into the United States if our own labor could make it. [Applause.] Let American labor, as far as practicable, manufacture American products. [Applause.] And if you do not like it, you know what you can do. [Laughter.] This Government is made for Americans, native-born and naturalized; and every pound, every bushel, every ton, every yard of foreign product that comes into this country to compete with ours deprives American labor of what justly belongs to it.

Do the farmers want increased importations of agricultural products? Of barley alone there were \$6,152,000 of value imported last year, and of vegetables a value of \$2,276,000. The total imports of the products of agriculture for the year 1887 free and dutiable were in value \$197,308,240. Of this sum \$46,678,443 was admitted free of duty and the remainder paid a duty. Do the agriculturists want the duties all removed and their products driven from this market. Seven million three hundred thousand dollars' worth of foreign glass came into this country last year. Do the glass-blowers want this volume increased? Five million five hundred and forty-five thousand dollars' worth of pottery of foreign make entered our market last year. Do the potters want this vast sum augmented? Will the wool-growers who were compelled to compete with \$16,000,000 worth of foreign wool last year relish the prospect of having their product further displaced next year; and the labor engaged in woolen manufactories in this country, are they anxious that the \$44,000,000 worth of woolen goods imported in 1887 in competition with the products of their labor shall be multiplied in 1889? All these importations will be greatly increased if this bill shall become a law. Every invoice of foreign goods which comes here the like of which we can make crowds out just so much American labor. Is there to be no limit to this foreign invasion?

I answer, only to the extent that our people shall make importations impossible by reducing the cost of the home product. This will be the only restraint upon foreign merchandise glutting this market to the displacement of our own. If our present labor conditions are maintained—and this bill gets upon our statute-book—there will be no barrier in the way of a perfect inundation of foreign goods in the United States. It should not be forgotten that low duties or no duties substitute foreign imports for home-made and home-grown products, and to the extent of such substitution take work and wages from American labor. The effect of this bill, and there can be no other, is to increase importations, displace our own products by foreign ones, diminish the output of our factories and mills, curtail the demand for labor, and reduce the wages of those who may be able to get work. This result is as clear and manifest to me as the simplest mathematical problem, and we have only to look at the wage scale of competing nations to know what our labor will come to with free trade or its equivalent. We can not compete with foreign nations without the restraint of a tariff unless we have equal conditions and equal labor cost. To do this we must introduce European conditions and European methods in the United States, and that is what this bill and all similar legislation mean.

"The trammels of trade must be removed" is the language employed by the friends of this bill. How and in what way? First, by removing the duty from raw materials used in manufacture, which of necessity

will be at the expense and loss of those engaged in preparing them. But to a tariff reformer that is of little account. This trammel must go, to enable the domestic manufacturer to compete with the foreign manufacturer at home and abroad. After this, and next in order, the trammel of high wages must be removed. This is the most important and essential of all. This is the chief obstruction. Free raw material will not equalize the condition of manufacturers at home with those abroad. Cheap labor, underpaid labor, underfed labor will be the next demand of the advocates of this bill. Some of them have been frank enough to avow it already. This is the inexorable logic of the situation. If we are to control the whole of our own market and send our manufactures across the sea, it can be accomplished in one way only, by reducing the cost of the home product to the same or below the cost of the foreign product. To do this every intelligent man knows involves an enormous reduction of the wages of American workingmen. To this a revenue tariff comes at last and from which there is no escape and against it every true American interest cries out in an emphatic and earnest protest.

I propose a wiser and more patriotic solution of the difficulties of our financial situation. If we will buy more American goods and less foreign, we will reduce the income of the Government and leave and increase the surplus among the people. If we will buy more American merchandise and less of foreign make, manufactures at home will run the year round and labor will be suitably rewarded and steadily employed. If we had some of that lofty patriotism evinced by the fathers, if we were more American in feeling, sentiment, and purpose, there would be fewer advocates of this bill.

AMERICAN WAGES AGAINST EUROPEAN WAGES.

There has been much effort made in this debate to show that, after all, American workingmen get no better pay than the workingmen of other countries. Let us consider this branch of the discussion for a little while, for if it be true that labor here is no better rewarded than elsewhere, then the strength of protection is much weakened. I beg to cite, against the unsupported statements of the gentlemen who have already spoken upon the other side, the testimony of American workingmen whose opportunity for information from experience in both countries, and otherwise, makes their evidence incontrovertible. From the statements made March 10, 1886, before the Committee on Ways and Means, I read. Some of this testimony is two years old, but the only reason it is so is because laboring men were not permitted to testify this year. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Roger Evans, workingman, speaking upon this subject, said:

Of course you must not gauge the American workingman by the amount of coarse bread and meat which will be necessary for him to subsist upon. It can not be. The American workingman must have other things than those. He must be fed and clothed and be able to maintain his family as becomes the dignity of an American citizen.

Another, Mr. Philip Hagan, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was born under a free-trade government; and I believe that that free-trade government deprived me of an education. The reason of that was that I had to go to work when I was eight years of age; and I remember also my little brother going to work under that free-trade government when he was eight years of age. I remember well when there was a family of nine of us (including my father and mother), and when my wages for working in a mill were 10 cents per day. That was under a free-trade government. Subsequently I went up higher there to 5 shillings a day, or \$1.25. That was about the limit I could reach—six and sixpence a day—and having to pay 60 cents out of that to my helper.

Many members of this committee know all this just as well as I am stating it, and I am not going to detain you any longer; but I will state that as soon as my limited knowledge informed me that labor was protected in the United States I came here. I declared my intentions and I became a citizen of the United States. And now I have a family, and now I make regularly 14 shillings a day. The produce on which I lived in England came mostly from the United States, and certainly I ought to get it as cheap here as in England. I worked for 5 shillings a day in England, and I get 14 shillings a day here. Consequently I am able to send my children to school, and they are getting an education, which their father did not get under a free-trade government. I want to see these children raised up and educated as citizens.

[Applause.]

Mr. Thomas Williams said:

As American citizens we can not be compelled to subsist upon what the working people of England, France, or other European countries subsist upon. The people of this country have made it just what it is, and in a very great measure the workingmen have made it what it is. Some of us have come across the Atlantic, leaving the land of our birth, and have come here with the expectations that we were going to better our condition. We have bettered it in a great measure. We will get along if you will let us alone. The manufacturers and ourselves will fight our own battles.

Mr. Thomas P. Jones said:

I came to this country to better my condition, and I am happy to say that I have bettered my condition. I have made more wages than I ever made in the old country.

It has been shown here to-day, and, as I think, very clearly, that this tinkering with the tariff is not for the best interests of the country; is not for the best interests of the wealth-producers, of the men who built up this country. Then, gentlemen, I take it that it is your duty to throw this bill to the dogs. I certainly do not stand to dictate to you altogether in this matter, but I will assure you this far: that there is a school of education among the working people in this country, and that if this tinkering of the tariff is allowed to proceed; if you will, in spite of our remonstrances, go on destroying our interests and shutting up the industries of the country, our working people will be ere long sufficiently educated to step forth and say, "Gentlemen, thus far shall you go, and no farther." We will elect men and send them here to legislate for our interests if you will not do so. We have the power, gentlemen, and you know it. Laborers in this country were never so cemented as they are to-day. One of

the principal things which has helped us to that is this very bill which the honorable chairman has brought before this committee. Where I live, in Chicago, you would be surprised to see the feeling that exists among the working classes. And why? Because some of the people there worked in this country in free-trade times. I have a brother-in-law who, in free-trade times, traveled to his work 6 miles in the morning, getting there at sun-up, worked all day, and walked home at sundown, and all for a paltry 50 cents a day. I also have worked for 80 cents a day, but not in this country, thank God. I have worked for 25 cents a day, but I do not want to have to do it again. I have seen in the city of Glasgow, in Scotland, men working for 12 cents a day and a bowl of soup. That does not become an American citizen. We can not have such a state of affairs here, and we will not have it.

I have a letter from Mr. William Barbour, of the Barbour Flax Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., under date of 31st of March, in which occurs the following:

DEAR SIR: As a stockholder and director of Barbour Flax-Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., I wish to make a statement to you regarding the flax-thread industry, and to call your attention to the effect which the proposed Mills bill would have upon it.

While I am an American born, and the industry I represent in Paterson, N. J., is thoroughly American, I am also a large stockholder in a flax-spinning company in Ireland; and that you may judge of the relative wages paid in the two countries, I would state that the pay-rolls of the two mills, as recently compared, differed only about \$500, the number of hands in the Irish mill being 2,900 against 1,400 in the New Jersey mill.

Yours, truly,

WM. BARBOUR.

Hon. W. McKINLEY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

That is, 1,400 American laborers are paid the exact sum which 2,900 laborers are paid for the same labor in Ireland, and yet gentlemen would have us believe there is no difference in favor of the American workman. [Applause.]

The Singer Sewing-Machine Company maintains a factory in Glasgow, Scotland, as well as its works in New Jersey. It employs one-third more hands in its Scotch establishment, yet the pay-roll there is only half that of its American works, the actual figures being \$18,000 and \$35,000.

Mr. HERBERT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HERBERT. Can the gentleman tell me the price a sewing-woman in Scotland pays for a sewing-machine and the price a sewing-woman in New Jersey pays for the same kind of a sewing-machine?

Mr. McKINLEY. Yes, sir; I am told the prices are about the same except a sewing-machine in Scotland costs more than a sewing-machine in America. [Laughter and applause.]

John H. Ross, superintendent Boston Thread and Twine Company, under date of April 23, 1888, says:

We are paying three times the average wages paid for similar labor throughout Europe.

Here is a letter under date of April 26, 1888, from the representatives of at least a half million workmen of the United States:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Having seen by the papers that Mr. MILLS and others, in their speeches in the House of Representatives upon the tariff bill, have asserted the wages paid to labor were no higher in the United States than in Europe, we, the undersigned, desire to state, through you, to the members of Congress that such statements are misleading and false. Wages are higher in this country than in any other in the world. Notwithstanding the fact that the statements have been made by members on the floor of the House of Representatives that the tariff only benefits the manufacturer, and that they receive all the advantages from the protection given by the Government, we know that we receive our share of the benefits of protection on the industries we represent.

We therefore emphatically protest against any reduction of the duties that will bring us on a level with the low price paid for labor in Europe. We insist upon the maintenance of a strong protective tariff, in order to maintain an American standard of wages for American workmen.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM WEIHE, President of
Amalgamated Association of Iron
and Steel Workers.

WM. MARTIN, Secretary of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.

JOHN CONKLING, Master Workman National Assembly Iron and Steel Workers' Knights of Labor.

JOHN COFFEY, Master Workman Glass Blowers' Assembly 149.

Hon. WILLIAM McKINLEY,
Washington, D. C.

This bill proposes to equalize American production with European production by bringing down American wages to the level of European wages, and, Mr. Chairman, I give you notice here to-day that you can not do it. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURAL WAGES.

Now as to farm wages here as contrasted with other countries. I have a letter from Mr. Dodge, the Statistician of the Agricultural Department:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1888.

The wages of white labor in agriculture in this country is about \$24 per month. In England, the average wages paid for agricultural labor, according to J. S. Jeans, in the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal, was about \$12.65 per month. It has been reduced since 1880.

In the Argentine Republic the common farm hands get \$10 to \$12 per month. In India agricultural wages are about \$20 to \$25 per year. Wages here in the wool-growing industry are two or three times as much as in competing countries.

Consul Wamer, at Cologne, in his official report of May 21, 1886, to the State Department, gives a statement of the increase of exports from Germany to the United States, also the wages paid. The laborer, whether he works in iron or steel works, factories, stone-quarries, or railroads, earns as a rule from 47 to 70 cents per day, and for skilled labor he may get from 80 to 92 cents per day. Women, when employed, earn from 24 to 30 cents per day. Boys under sixteen receive 19 to 24 cents a day, and an extra strong boy may earn 30 cents. Working hours are from 6 to 6 in summer, and 7 to 7 in winter, with one hour for dinner.

The consul-general at Vienna, in speaking of the Austrian laborer, says a home of his own, though ever so modest, is beyond his reach.

Consul Tanner, at Chemnitz, Saxony, says:

The customary wages to hired servants on a farm are \$57.19 per year, with board and lodging, for men, and \$28.50 for females. Field hands are paid at the rate of 5½ cents per hour. Women receive 2½ cents per hour.

Speaking of their food, he says:

Sugar or sirup are never allowed, and but very little milk. Tea is never used. For dinner they have meat and vegetables three times a week, and always on Sundays.

This effectually disposes of the claim that wages in England and other countries are as high as here.

WAGES IN THE SOUTH AND PROTECTION TO RICE.

The wage question in the South is interesting, and I have seen it no better stated, and the reason for maintaining protection nowhere more strongly presented than in the report made this year on the American rice industry, prepared by the Rice Association and addressed to the association of Savannah. I read:

During this period [from 1840 to 1860] the duty on foreign rice was 20 per cent. ad valorem. In all the rice-producing divisions of the country slave labor was then employed, and no foreign rice was imported.

It will be noted that slave labor operates as a positive prohibition to foreign imports. It takes the place of a protective tariff, and presents to labor a choice between the one and the other.

Cheap labor can successfully compete with cheap labor on equal terms and with equal chance of profits in the markets of the world without the aid of legislative protection, and what I have read shows the character of labor best adapted to free trade. This report says the conditions surrounding the American producer have entirely changed. Let me read:

Since the emancipation of the slaves the cost of agricultural labor in the South has been greatly increased. In the rice districts of the Carolinas and Georgia field labor ranges from 40 to 60 cents, and the best expert (not mechanical) labor to \$1 per diem.

So that no time since 1865 could rice have been cultivated as a staple product without the protection afforded by import duties upon foreign grain.

Now, with what labor does the Southern rice-grower compete? I will read from this report a quotation from the report of the United States minister at Peking:

Coming now to the field-hand whom the farmer hires, we arrive at the substratum of labor. The average wages of an able-bodied young man is \$12 per annum, food, straw, shoes, and free shaving. Deducting \$4 for his clothing, he saves \$8 annually—or may do so.

Ten years' saving will enable him to buy one-third of an acre of land (value per acre, \$150) and necessary implements by which he can attain by his own labor subsistence. * * * In ten years he can become possessor of two-thirds of an acre.

The report goes on further:

In Japan, the field-hands receive their food and lodging with wages from \$8.60 to \$12.96 per annum. The wages of females are about \$6 per annum.

In British India the per diem is 6 cents for males and 1½ cents for females.

In Kurnel the highest permanent wages are 50 cents per month.

In Borat men employed by the year get from 80 to 100 pounds of grain per month, and from 44½ cents to \$1.98 per annum.

In Bombay and Madras laborers are paid from 6 to 12 cents per diem.

Hence the wages paid at the South in the rice-fields are many fold greater than those paid to laborers in the rice-fields of Asia. Two-thirds of the cost of production is disbursed in wages in the former.

The report then concludes:

The contrast in this element of cost should render unnecessary any further comment than that without the intervention of the existing import tax on Asiatic rice competition would seem impossible.

This argument I commend for its force and fairness, and it makes out a strong case for the rice-grower, who in my judgment deserves protection and which we cheerfully accord; but the same argument applies with equal force to domestic wool, flax, and hemp, and other products of agriculture and manufacture. They are all within the same principle; all of them cultivated and produced with wage-labor greatly in excess of that paid abroad. Yet these American products are to be severely crippled, if not wholly destroyed.

This statement of the rice-growers is a most striking demonstration of the wisdom and necessity of protection. It shows what is true in the North is true in the South. The chief and controlling question is one of labor, and so long as the labor cost here in any department of employment exceeds the labor cost in Europe so long we must have a protective tariff which shall compensate for this difference. And whether the labor is in the rice-fields of Georgia and of the Carolinas, or in the wheat-fields of the Northwest, in the factories of New England, the mines of Maryland and Virginia, or the furnaces of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, it must be protected against the less rewarded labor

whose products come in competition with theirs. Either this tariff must be maintained to maintain the difference of wages or one of two things must inevitably occur: we must abandon production in many of the most valuable fields of industry here or our labor must come down to the standard of the competing labor; and we may discuss our theories until the frosts of December and we can not alter the fact.

This is the issue and it can not be evaded.

LABOR NOT ASKING FOR IT—CHEAP CLOTHING.

It is a fact worthy to call to the attention of the House that a labor organization representing a million working men, with its representatives in this city whose sole duty is to look after the interests of labor, have given no sign of approval of this bill. Not a petition has come through this source asking for its passage, or anything like it. Whatever utterance has been made has been in opposition and protest. Every member on this floor has observed the activity of this committee of Knights of Labor in regard to legislation affecting the interests of labor, but in all their vast constituency, found in every State of the Union, found in the fields, in the factories, workshops, and mines, no word or sign but of disapproval and condemnation has come.

The expectations of cheaper clothes is not sufficient to justify the action of the majority. This is too narrow for a national issue. Nobody, so far as I have learned, has expressed dissatisfaction with the present price of clothing. It is a political objection; it is a party slogan. Certainly nobody is unhappy over the cost of clothing except those who are amply able to pay even a higher price than is now exacted. And besides, if this bill should pass, and the effect would be (as it inevitably must be) to destroy our domestic manufactures, the era of low prices would vanish, and the foreign manufacturer would compel the American consumer to pay higher prices than he has been accustomed to pay under "the robber tariff," so called.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district comprising some 200,000 people, a large majority of the voters in the district being workmen. I have represented them for a good many years, and I have never had a complaint from one of them, that their clothes were too high. Have you? [Applause on the Republican side.] Has any gentleman on this floor met with such complaint in his district?

Mr. MORSE. They did not buy them of me.

Mr. MCKINLEY. No! Let us see; if they had bought of the gentleman from Massachusetts it would have made no difference, and there could have been no complaint. Let us examine the matter.

[Mr. MCKINLEY here produced a bundle containing a suit of clothes, which he opened and displayed amidst great laughter and applause.]

Come now, will the gentleman from Massachusetts know his own goods? [Renewed laughter.] We recall, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means talked about the laboring man who worked for ten days at a dollar a day, and then went with his ten dollars wages to buy a suit of clothes. It is the old story. It is found in the works of Adam Smith. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I have heard it in this House for ten years past. It has served many a free-trader. It is the old story, I repeat, of the man who gets a dollar a day for his wages, and having worked for the ten days goes to buy his suit of clothes. He believes he can buy it for just \$10; but "the robber manufacturers" have been to Congress, and have got 100 per cent. put upon the goods in the shape of a tariff, and the suit of clothes he finds can not be bought for \$10, but he is asked \$20 for it, and so he has got to go back to ten days more of sweat; ten days more of toil; ten days more of wear and tear of muscle and brain to earn the \$10 to purchase the suit of clothes. Then the chairman gravely asks is not ten days entirely annihilated?

Now, a gentleman who read that speech or heard it was so touched by the pathetic story that he looked into it and sent me a suit of clothes identical with that described by the gentleman from Texas, and he sends me also the bill for it, and here is the entire suit, "robber tariffs and taxes and all" have been added, and the retail cost is what? Just \$10. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] So the poor fellow does not have to go back to work ten days more to get that suit of clothes. He takes the suit with him and pays for it just \$10. [Applause.]

But in order that there might be no mistake about it, knowing the honor and honesty of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], he went to his store and bought the suit. [Laughter and cheers on the Republican side.] I hold in my hand the bill.

Mr. STRUBLE. Read it.

Mr. MCKINLEY (reading):

Boston, May 4, 1888.

J. D. Williams, bought of LEOPOLD MORSE & Co.; men's youth's, and boys' clothing; 131 to 137 Washington street, corner of Brattle—

I believe it is.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Brattle.

Mr. MCKINLEY (reading):

To one suit of woolen clothes, \$10. Paid.

[Renewed laughter and applause.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, I never knew of a gentleman engaged in this business who sold his clothes without a profit. [Laughter.] And there is the same \$10 suit described by the gentleman from Texas that can be bought in the city of Boston, can be bought in Philadelphia, in

New York, in Chicago, in Pittsburgh, anywhere throughout the country at \$10 retail the whole suit, coat, pants, and vest, and 40 per cent. less than it could have been bought in 1860 under your low tariff and low wages of that period. [Great applause.] It is a pity to destroy the sad picture of the gentleman from Texas which was to be used in the campaign, but the truth must be told. But do you know that if it was not for protection you would pay a great deal more for these clothes? I do not intend to go into that branch of the question, but I want to give one brief illustration of how the absence of American competition immediately sends up the foreign prices, and it is an illustration that every man will remember. My friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARKE], who sits in front of me, will remember it. The Missouri Glass Company was organized several years ago for the manufacture of coarse fluted glass and cathedral glass. Last November the factory was destroyed by fire. Cathedral glass was their specialty. Within ten days from the time that splendid property was reduced to ashes the foreign price of cathedral glass advanced 28 per cent. to the American consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.] Showing that whether you destroy the American production by free trade or by fire it is the same thing; the price goes up to the American consumer, and all you can do is to pay the price the foreigner chooses to ask. [Renewed applause.]

THE POOR MAN'S BLANKETS.

Now, the gentleman had a lot of blankets here the other day. The very climax of the gentleman's speech was reached when he came to a description of the American blankets, and the enormous burdens that the tariff laid upon the poor man's bed and covering. Why, you would have supposed that he was enunciating the national issue for 1888, and I think really that is about all they have left now that civil-service reform is gone. [Laughter.]

Now what is the fact? He told you that for one pair of 5-pound blankets, which he exhibited, the price was \$2.51, the labor cost 35 cents, the tariff \$1.90, and the difference between the labor and the duty \$1.55. Then the gentleman from Texas turned to this House and to his admiring associates and listening audience and said: "Why does not the manufacturer give the laborer that \$1.55, the difference between the labor cost and the duty?" which inquiry was followed by deafening applause.

Did he not leave the impression upon the mind of everyone that the manufacturer got the duty? He asked why did he not give it to the laborer? and turning he said: "Of course he would not do that; he put it into his pocket." I will tell you the reason, or at least a sufficient reason why the manufacturer did not give it to the laborer. It was because he did not get it himself.

I do not know where the gentleman got his figures, but I have a careful statement from one of the leading blanket manufacturers of this country, and I intend to give the facts fully.

Blankets are numbered according to grade and according to weight. There are several grades of five-pound blankets numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. A No. 1 five-pound blanket made in the city of Philadelphia sells for \$1.72. The labor represented in the blanket is 87½ cents; the duty is \$1.02. Of a scarlet blanket, five pounds, the price is \$2.27; the labor is 87½ cents; the duty is \$3.17. Of the white all-wool Falls of Schuylkill blanket the price is \$3.62; the labor \$1.05; the duty \$2.60. Of the Gold-Medal blanket the price is \$4.53; the labor \$1.05; the duty \$3.50.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the duty was added to the cost, what would the American manufacturers get for these blankets? They should get for the first blanket \$2.74. How much do they get? They get only \$1.72. They should get for the second blanket, duty added, \$3.77. How much do they get? They get \$2.27. They should get for the third \$5.12. How much do they get? They get \$3.17. They should get, duty added, for the fourth class \$6.22. How much do they get? They get \$4.35. They should get, duty added, for the highest grade, \$8.03. How much do they get? They get \$4.05.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what did these same blankets cost in 1860 under a revenue tariff, under the free-trade domination of this country by the Democratic party? What did we pay for the same blankets that year as contrasted with what we pay now? The blanket that sells to-day for \$1.02 sold in 1860 for \$2. The blanket that sells now for \$1.45 sold in 1860 for \$2.50. The blanket that sells now for \$1.31 sold in 1860 for \$2.25. The blanket that sells now for \$1.90 sold in 1860 for \$3.50. The blanket that sells now for \$2.58 sold for \$3.75 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for \$4.35 sold for \$7.50 in 1860. The blanket that sells for \$5.85 now sold for \$10 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for \$6.80 sold for \$13 in 1860.

PRICES OF 1860 AND 1888 COMPARED.

Now let us see how the wages are, for that is an essential element in this question. In 1860 a spinner got \$6 a week in this same establishment, and I am speaking from the books of the manufacturer. It is no idle and hearsay, second-hand statement that I am making, nor does it come from any foreign source, nor is it based on any information from abroad. It is taken from the actual books of a manufacturer of blankets in Philadelphia, who has been manufacturing for a great many years. A spinner got for a week's work in 1860, \$6. What does he get now? Fifteen dollars. Six dollars a week in 1860, and \$15 a week in 1888! A piecer boy got \$1.15 a week in 1860, and he gets \$3.50

now. A weaver got \$4 in 1860, and \$10 in 1888. A finisher, unskilled, got \$4.15 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. A skilled finisher got \$6 in 1860, and \$16 in 1888. A dye-house hand, unskilled, got \$4.25 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. A common laborer \$4 in 1860, and gets \$7.50 in 1888. A skilled laborer got \$4.50 in 1860, and he gets \$9 in 1888. An engineer got \$6.50 in 1860, and he gets \$16 in 1888.

The weekly earnings of the spinner in 1860 could buy three pairs of cheap blankets for one week's work. The spinner under American protection in 1888, for the price of one week's work can buy fifteen pairs of blankets. Talk about productive capacity! Think about buying capacity! The spinner buys his blankets for one-half what they cost him in 1860; and he gets two and a half times as much for his labor in 1888 as he got in 1860. Do you wonder these men do not like your bill? [Applause.] Do you wonder these men condemn the action of the committee for not listening to their protests? Why, you are preparing here to-day—and that is the purpose and effect of this bill—you are preparing here to reduce the scale of American wages. But I am not through with the blanket issue. You may think that what I have already given is sufficiently exhaustive, but I have an actual transaction here that I know will be of interest to the members of this House, and, therefore, at the expense of wearying your patience, I am going to ask your attention to it. [Cries of "Go on!"]

THE UNITED STATES BUYING FOREIGN BLANKETS.

On the 25th of March, 1887, the United States Government advertised for bids for the purchase of blankets for the use of the medical department of the Army. This was in 1887, under the present Administration. There were foreign bids and there were American bids. Now, if the President is right in saying that the duty is added to the cost, then the foreign cost, duty added, ought to be just equal to the American price. Now, what are the facts of this transaction? As I have said, there was a foreign bid, and there was an American bid. The foreign bid was for a four-pound blanket for medical purposes, to be furnished for \$2.25. For the same four-pound blanket for the same purposes, the American bid was \$2.56, there being a difference of 30³/₁₀ cents. Who, who do you suppose got the contract? There was a foreign bid, and an American bid, and the difference between the bids was 30 cents on each blanket. Now tell me which manufacturer, the American or English got the contract? Is there anybody here who would not have given it to the American, there being a difference of only 30 cents between the bids?

Is there any gentleman on this floor who would send abroad to get a pair of blankets merely to save 30 cents on them, thus taking away from the American manufacturer and the American farmer and the American laborer that much business? However that may be, that contract did go abroad. English labor, with foreign wool, made those 2,000 blankets for the use of our army. American labor was boycotted and they came in without paying any duty. The Government took advantage of a law that stands on the statute-book and admitted them free of duty. There being so little revenue in the Treasury, it was necessary, of course, to save every penny, so they took advantage of that law which permits the United States to bring in goods free of duty.

Now let us look at the figures. The duty on blankets of that quality is 18 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. Eighteen cents a pound upon 2,000 blankets, 4 pounds each, is \$1,440; 35 per cent. ad valorem is \$1,576.40, making a total duty upon those 2,000 blankets, which were bought from a foreign blanket maker, of \$3,016.40. The cost of those blankets, free of duty, amounts to \$4,504; with the duty added the total would be \$7,520.40.

Now, if the President is right and if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is right in saying that this duty is added to the price to the American consumer, then \$7,520.40 is exactly what the American price would be.

Now, then, gentlemen, what was the American price? The American price was \$5,120. That is, it was \$2,400 less than the foreign cost, duty added. Without any duty, the difference between the cost of the American and the cost of the foreign blankets, the whole 2,000, was about \$600. Now you see the American manufacturer does not get the duty, and that, I submit, is a sufficient reason why he does not give it to his workmen. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States did not know of this transaction, which had occurred under his own administration, so that he might have avoided making the blunder which he made in his message when he said that the duty was added to the cost. And I do not know what those around me may think about it, but I am very sorry that our Government went abroad and bought those blankets just to save 30 cents apiece on them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish that this Government of ours, which is supported by its own people, and not by foreigners, would patronize its own people. I think that is an example of patriotism which should be set by those charged with public administration. I wish the men who pay the taxes to support this Government, to pay the President's salary and other expenses of the Government, would be patronized when the Government has anything to buy, don't you? And are you not a little ashamed of this transaction, all of you? I do not know whether the like was ever done under any former administration or not; but it never ought to be done, except in time of war or great public necessity,

by any future administration of any party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

ALL EUROPE INTERESTED IN THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL.

All Europe is watching the progress of this bill. Its immediate promoters are not following it with keener vigilance and more absorbing interest than their foreign sympathizers. All trades, all manufacturers across the Atlantic, are watching it with the deepest concern and anticipating the rich harvest which awaits them when our gates shall be opened, our industrial defenses torn down, and free and unrestrained access to our splendid markets afforded for the products of their cheap labor.

I have in my hand the Pottery Gazette, published in London, under date of January 2, 1888, from which I read:

Earthenware is reported to be reduced to 30 per cent. This will help the trade, but we trust the men and masters here will not be too sanguine as to results and upset the trade.

Their information upon the earthenware schedule is quite accurate; they had it in advance of the minority members of the committee, and while thoroughly pleased the editor of the Gazette feels constrained to advise the men and masters not to be too sanguine as to results and thereby upset the trade and defeat the bill. He advises them not to rejoice too soon; the news is almost too good to be true, and too much ecstasy on their part might prejudice it before the American House. Why should they rejoice when our tariff goes down? Our workmen and employers have no such feeling. They dread it; they oppose it; they know what it means to them. They know that it will benefit the foreign rival and bring distress to them.

The reduction of duties upon earthenware will help Staffordshire, England, and their people know it well, while it will hurt American potters and the labor they employ.

Again I read:

Our American friends are expected over shortly—

They are detained here during the pendency of this bill—

when we shall hear what the effect is to be of the promised alteration in their tariff. The protected manufacturers in the States are already making efforts to stop the reduced imports, but it will be useless.

With what confidence they speak! They mistake the temper of our people. They are staking too much upon the fulfillment of Democratic pledges.

This long nursed and favored class must give way a little to the consumer, whose long suffering has at length come to the front.

The generous sympathy which the English manufacturer has for the American consumer is touching indeed.

The consumers are as ten to one of the United States inhabitants, and the protection to the pottery and glass manufacturer of the commoner description represents the cost of labor many times over.

This reads like the speech of the gentleman from Texas. It sounds so like the Democratic speeches of the last two weeks that we might well conclude that the gentlemen of the majority on this floor were representing an English and not an American constituency.

Again I read:

Is this fair to the housekeeper? Is it right? Nay, is it just?

This sympathy would have been more highly appreciated by the American consumer had it been extended at a time when the Staffordshire potteries controlled the American market, before we had become successful competitors, and when they were charging us 100 per cent. more for the coarse tableware that went into the houses of the masses than we now have to pay, resulting from the competition created by our own potteries. The hope of foreign producers is in the Democratic party.

Foreign producers are already preparing for the new order of things. They are already establishing agencies in the United States, preparing to invade and occupy this market.

I have among my notes a letter from Andris Jochams, of Charleroi, Belgium, proprietors of the La Providence Rolling Mills, which gives unmistakable evidence of preparation for the passage of this bill.

Let me read the letter:

CHARLEROI, 16 14th March, 1888.

DEAR SIRS: I beg to take notice that we have appointed Messrs. Weir, Smith & Rogers as our sole and general agents in the United States of America for the sale of our architectural iron, as per circular inclosed, and you will oblige us in addressing your demands to them in future.

With the prospect of a reduction in duties on architectural iron and steel in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us.

We remain, dear sirs, with much respect, your obedient servant.

ANDRIS JOCHAMS.

MESSRS. WEIR, SMITH & ROGERS, 41 Broadway, New York.

The American public, it will be observed, is assured that "with the prospect of reduction of duties on architectural iron and steel in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us." Reduced duties are to increase their profit which, for the time, at least, is to be divided so as to give to the American importer a "nice profit."

TRUSTS.

There has been much discussion about trades and combinations in the course of this debate—trusts to control prices, diminish produc-

tion, extinguish competition—and these are made a fruitful theme for vicious assaults upon the tariff. This is the only new feature that has been developed in the tariff discussion, and therefore deserves passing attention. I have no sympathy with combinations organized for this or any other purpose, to control the supply and thereby control prices. I regard all such as against public policy and opposed to fair and legitimate trade. They are, however, in no wise related to the tariff, and the tariff is in no way responsible for them.

There is nothing in the tariff laws to promote or even suggest them. They are of foreign origin—they originated in free-trade countries. They can and do exist among producers and factors not in any way affected by the tariff. They are of recent date in the United States. The most widely known trusts of the country are not engaged in what are termed "protected industries." The oil trust and the whisky trust, which are so commanding and powerful, which make prices and alter them, control supply and production, these surely can not be charged to a protective tariff, for nothing which they make or merchandise is subject to protective tariffs. The most oppressive trusts—oppressive to the American consumer—are those which deal in foreign goods, and all of which will be promoted and strengthened by the passage of this bill.

There is a trust or combination made up of all the plate-glass manufacturers of Europe. I have here a circular which is dated London, 25th of April, 1887, and which reads:

DEAR SIR: We beg to inform you that the Associated Plate-Glass Manufacturers have revised their prices for plate-glass of all descriptions, and that, withdrawing all previous quotations, we inclose you herewith our tariff of prices, the discount from which will be 30 per cent., with the exception of glazing glass used for silvering purposes, the discount from which will be 25 per cent.

We are, dear sir, yours, respectfully,

LONDON AND MANCHESTER PLATE-GLASS
MANUFACTURING COMPANY (LIMITED.)
UNION PLATE-GLASS COMPANY (LIMITED.)
PILKINGTON BROTHERS.

A de GRAND RY. AGENCE GÉNÉRALE DES GLACERIES, Belges.

This trust is still in force. Here is a foreign combination to control the price of plate-glass, and the gentlemen on the other side are engaged in making the monopoly more complete and controlling by reducing the import duties now paid on their product and by relieving them of a burden they now have to bear, and thus enabling them to break down American competition, which alone has reduced the price of plate-glass, and now prevents the most extortionate exactions for the foreign product upon American consumers.

Here, again, is an importers' trust in the same line of goods. I read from the New York Herald of February 28 an account of the investigation by the New York Legislature:

THE GLASS TRUST.

Mr. James H. Heroy, an importer of plate and French glass, was next called to tell what he knew about the glass trust. He is a spry old gentleman who has been in the business for fifty years. Colonel Bliss asked the witness to identify a circular. It is a very peculiar circular, and will open the eyes of the public, if not the eyes of the committee. It is as follows:

"HENRY C. MARRINER,

"Plate and sheet-glass importer, No. 126 South Fifth avenue:

"We beg leave to quote you 70, 10, and 5 per cent. discount from the price-list, January 20, 1887, for French window-glass. In case you wish to make any large purchases we can make you extra discounts as follows: If you receive from us or any members of our association in New York (which includes all the regular importers), either all from one house or part from each of the houses, one hundred boxes in one calendar month, you are entitled to an extra discount of 5 per cent.; or if the deliveries to you in any one calendar month from any or all of these houses should amount to \$1,000, then you will be entitled to an extra discount of 10 per cent. This is done, as you will see, to give large purchasers the advantage over small buyers, which they have been long entitled to, but which could not be given to them until we made our present organization to regulate prices.

"This arrangement of rebates takes effect from February 1.

"We can also make deductions from the new price-list of January 5, 1888, for colored, enameled, ground, and cathedral glass, extra discounts, as follows:

"For orders of twenty cases or 2,000 feet or more at one time, 10 per cent. discount.

"For import orders of 7,500 feet or more of cathedral and one hundred cases or more colored, enameled, and ground glass we will make special prices, according to the conditions of the order.

"Yours, very truly,

"HEROY & MARRINER."

NOTHING DONE IN A HURRY.

There was no doubt about the intention of that trust. Mr. Heroy said "it was simply" to make prices below which they would not sell their goods. At the last meeting he attended he thought it was the desire of the combination to reduce prices, and added, "We have not yet decided what to do in the case of a man who undersells us. We do not decide these things in a hurry. As a result of the combination prices have advanced. I can't tell exactly the amount of the business done. It is largely exaggerated, but including all branches, it is about \$20,000,000."

I have also in my possession a copy of the trust contract. Not content with making this combination among themselves, they sought in every way possible to induce our American producers of plate-glass to join them and assist in fleecing the American public.

There is a foreign trust on china and earthen ware. I have the evidence here in the London Pottery Gazette of March 10, 1888, from which I read:

If any manufacturers are not true to the rules of the new association the bond they will have signed will enable their fellow-manufacturers to sell them up "rump and stump." Nothing but the state of dire necessity into which the

trade has fallen would tempt men to put their hands to such a bond. The scheme has just been successful with the china manufacturers. They have just obtained a second advance.

If the keen buyers who always want to beggar the trade and reduce prices say to a manufacturer who will not sell at lower than the fixed rate, "Well, if I am forced to pay the association price I will not buy from you," such manufacturer can reply, "All right; if you buy from another, and I have to stand for orders, I shall get my pull out of your business, for our rules will not let me suffer through refusing to reduce at your request." So you see one manufacturer can not be played off against the others.

There is a foreign tin trust and a foreign iron trust to control prices and deprive the public of the advantages of legitimate competition. All these are to be benefited by this bill. Its author should change its title so as to make it read, "An act to promote foreign trusts and combines and break down American competition." We should set our faces against all these unnatural associations. We should crush out those at home, and do nothing to encourage those abroad who organize to prey upon the American market. We can control the former, but the latter, while robbing our own citizens, are beyond our control and out of our jurisdiction.

PROTECTION SENTIMENT EXTENDING.

Mr. Chairman, while the Democratic majority, aided by the active force of the Administration, is seeking to break down the protective system, under which we have realized such unexampled prosperity, what do we witness elsewhere and in other countries? Within the last six months there was held a great meeting in England, representing thirty thousand workmen. The meeting was called to consider the depressed condition of labor, and to demand such a change of the fiscal legislation as would abandon free trade in the United Kingdom and adopt a protective tariff. They resolved—

First. That this meeting is strongly of opinion that the time has come when all classes interested in the nation's prosperity should unite in demanding a revision of its fiscal system.

Second. That this meeting records its opinion that all articles imported from abroad should bear a fair share of taxation with the same articles produced at home.

These resolutions, with a suitable memorial, were presented to the British Parliament. In the same month the Chamber of Commerce of Lincolnshire, England, adopted the following resolutions:

That this meeting is of opinion that the fearful depression both of trade and agriculture are intimately connected with, and both are caused by, foreign competition, resulting in low prices, which are affecting all the industries of this country; that false free trade is a failure obtained at the expense of the native producer. This meeting, therefore, begs to urge of their representatives in Parliament and the Government the necessity of speedily taking measures to prevent the ruin impending over trade, and especially over the land of this country and all concerned in it, either as owners, cultivators, or tradesmen, and that a reconsideration should at once take place of our present fiscal arrangement.

The working people of England find that competition with countries employing cheaper labor too oppressive to bear longer, and are demanding in the interest of themselves and families to be saved from the further degradation it will entail. It is not American competition they dread; it is the competition of France, Germany, and Belgium—countries whose labor is even more poorly paid than the labor of England. They have come to appreciate at last that nothing but tariffs which are defensive in their character will save them from utter ruin and destitution. We will be in precisely the same situation if this bill shall become a law. Our competition is with all the world, for no labor is so well paid as ours, and being the highest paid labor invites the sharpest competition from the lowest. We will have no objection to free trade when all the competing nations shall bring the level of their labor up to ours; when they shall accept our standard; when they shall regard the toiler as a man and not a slave; but we will never consent while we have votes and the power to prevent the dragging down of our labor to that of the European standard. [Applause.] Let them elevate theirs; let them bring theirs up to our level, and we will then have no contention about revenue or protective tariffs. We will meet them in open field, in home and neutral markets, upon equal footing, and the fittest will survive. [Applause.] This is no time to seriously think of changing our policy. The best sentiment, the practical judgment of mankind, is turning to it. Sir Charles Tupper said a year ago in the Canadian House of Commons:

No person who has carefully watched the progress of public events and public opinion can fail to know that a very great and marked change has taken place in all countries. I may say, in relation to this question (protection). * * * In England, where it was a heresy to intimate anything of that kind a few years ago, even at the period to which I am referring, a great and marked change in public opinion has taken place. Professor Sidgwick, a learned Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and professor of moral philosophy in that great university, and the gentleman who read at the meeting of the British Association in 1886 a paper on political economy, has published a work in which opinions that would have been denounced as utterly fallacious and heretical at that time have been boldly propounded as the soundest and truest principles of political economy. * * * Statesmen of the first rank, men occupying high and commanding positions in public affairs in England, have unhesitatingly committed themselves to the strongest opinion in favor of fair protection to British industry.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Why, even Canada, a dependency of free-trade England, is too wise to favor the false doctrines of her mother, and has rejected her teachings, and to-day is prosperous under a protective system, which she in the main borrowed from us. I wish every citizen might read the budget speech of the minister of finance in Canada, and contrast it with

that of my honored but misguided friend from Texas. On the 12th of May, 1887, in the Commons, Sir Charles Tupper, in speaking of a previous period in the history of Canada under free trade, said:

When the languishing industries of Canada embarrassed the finance minister of that day, when instead of large surplus large deficits succeeded year after year, the opposition urged upon that honorable gentleman that he should endeavor to give increased protection to the industries of Canada, which would prevent them from thus languishing and being destroyed. We were not successful—I will not say in leading the honorable gentleman himself to the conclusion that that would be a sound policy, for I have some reason to believe that he had many a misgiving on that question—but at all events we were not able to change the policy of the gentleman who then ruled the destinies of Canada. As is well known, that became the great issue at the subsequent general election of 1878, and the Conservative party being returned to power, pledged to promote and foster the industries of Canada as far as they were able, brought down a policy through the hands of my honored predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, * * * and I have no hesitation in saying that the success of that policy thus propounded and matured from time to time has been such as to command the support and confidence of a large portion of the people of this country down to the present day.

Under this system he proceeds to show that Canada has enjoyed a prosperity the like of which she never enjoyed before, and then, instead of recommending a reduction of duties, proposes the increase of duties upon certain foreign merchandise, to the end that Canadian industries may be fostered thereby.

Here is what the gentleman from Texas, our premier, says. Mark the contrast:

Now, sir, what has been the result of this policy [of protection]? Enormous taxation upon the necessities of life has been a constant drain upon the people; taxation, not only to support the expenditures of the Government, but taxation so contrived as to fill the pockets of a privileged class and take from the people five dollars for private purposes for every dollar that it carries to the public Treasury. * * * This is one of the vicious results, etc. * * * What use have our manufacturers for the tariff at all? Why are they constantly beseeching Congress not to ruin them by reducing war rates? * * * It is a policy that is at war with the institutions of this country—the concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a few.

My friend has not read with profit or purpose the history of his country. Wedded to the economic teachings of Calhoun and Walker, he has not observed their contradiction and refutation in the matchless progress of his country. He still lives in the past. The condition of his own State, her boundless resources, appeal to him, but her voice, if heard, is not heeded. He seeks to throw across her pathway and the pathway of the Republic the tattered dogmas of a half century ago and stop the wheels of progress, interrupt our advancing civilization, and stifle the just aspirations of the people. The country is in no frame of mind for such retrogression; against it every instinct of humanity revolts, every noble sentiment protests.

If the people of the country want free trade or a strictly revenue tariff it is their privilege to have it. The majority voices should be controlling, but it must be after a full, fair, and candid expression. I do not believe that a majority in this House were instructed by their constituents to vote for this bill or any other committed to the doctrine of free trade. If the issue had been so understood many of the gentlemen who are promoting this legislation would not be here. I do not believe the country understood in 1886 that if the Democratic party carried a majority in the House it would do what is now being proposed. How many Representatives on that side of the House would have been left at home upon a platform favoring free wool and substantially free agricultural products? More by far than your majority.

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON THE ISSUE BETWEEN A REVENUE TARIFF AND A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The opportunity of the people of this country is next November. If they want free trade they can so vote, but they must have it after full discussion. The majority now on the floor of this House were not instructed by the elections in 1886 to vote for this bill; there was no such issue. Wherever we sought to make it the issue it was obscured or denied by Democratic protectionists in the North. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the friend of labor. [Laughter.]

The House of Representatives, I say, was not elected upon that issue. I challenge your party, under the instructions given you by the people two years ago, to force this measure through the House.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. McKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I voted for the consideration of the Morrison bill; and my people sent me back here by double my previous majority.

Mr. McKINLEY. I am aware of that; I had not intended to allude to the gentleman at all. A man who has under his control thirty or forty thousand miles of railroad; a man who has coal mines all over creation; a man who has great plantations down here in Virginia, must be a very weak candidate, indeed, if he can not come to Congress in an off year on almost any issue. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I have been a Democrat all my life; and in a Presidential year I was elected to this House in a district which gave Mr. Blaine 6,000 majority, and gave me 900. [Applause.]

Mr. McKINLEY. I am very glad if the gentleman made the issue on free trade; but if he did, he is the only man in the North who did so. And when he was elected in 1884, he had not voted for the Morrison bill; had you [addressing Mr. SCOTT]?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKINLEY. Did you vote for the Morrison bill before 1884? Mr. SCOTT. I voted for the Morrison bill before my people elected me for my second term.

Mr. McKINLEY. But you had not done so before being elected the first time.

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir.

Mr. McKINLEY. You were boasting of the immense majority you had in 1884, when Mr. Blaine was a candidate.

Mr. SCOTT. No. The gentleman from Ohio said that I was elected in an "off year." I replied that I had been a Democrat all my life, and that in a Presidential campaign, when Mr. Blaine carried my district by 6,000 majority, I was elected by a majority of 900; and at the next election, after I had voted for the Morrison bill, I carried the district by double the majority that I had received before. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McKINLEY. What I cannot understand is this: If the gentleman's district believes in free-trade and is against protection, how did it happen to give 6,000 majority for Mr. Blaine? [Applause.]

Go back to the people and ask to be returned on this bill and the President's message; do not dodge or equivocate, but stand up to the issue squarely, make your platform in Connecticut the same as in the Carolinas, in New York and New Jersey, the same as Mississippi and Georgia; and then if your majority is returned you will be commissioned to adopt this bill or something like unto it, abandoning the American for the British policy. [Applause.] The details at this time can be of little moment. This bill points to the overthrow of the protective system; that is its tendency and mission.

It is the system which is on trial; not one item or one schedule of the tariff, but the principle upon which the whole rests. Nothing which that side of the House can do or will do touching the tariff can be other than hurtful. If it corrected a single abuse or inequality or incongruity it will be at the expense and sacrifice of many great interests. It is destruction, not correction you are after. When your bill levels at all it levels down. When it equalizes articles belonging to the same group and family, representing the same raw material and the same amount of labor, its equality is with the lowest. It does not help that which bears the lowest duty, but destroys that which bears the highest. It injures the whole that it may put the whole upon the same footing. It gives no consideration or protection to a single home industry or American product, except probably cotton and rice. It puts no languishing American industry on its feet; it sets in motion no idlespindles; it starts no new fires; it creates no increased demand for labor; if an industry is down it keeps it there, its very breath is paralyzation, it injures what it touches and touches that it may injure. [Great applause.]

If the tariff needs revision—and in some particulars revision would improve it—it must be done by its friends and in full recognition of the principle of protection. It must be done by a party with courage enough to raise duties if needed and reduce them if unnecessarily, and with wisdom enough to foresee and provide against redundant revenue, and in correcting inequalities prudent enough to inflict no injury upon any, but bring good to all. That is the correction of inequalities to which the Republican party pledged itself in its national platform of 1884, and for the fulfillment of which it has not since then had a majority in the House to enforce. If it had it would have long ago been done. It will do it when it is again in control. Not correction which destroys, but which makes simple, harmonious, and equitable all of the provisions of the tariff.

It is fortunate that our Government is founded upon the consent of the governed, that every citizen has a voice in making and unmaking the House of Representatives every two years, and even if he is deprived in the interim of a hearing there is one day when he can speak and vote and make his influence felt [applause]; for I tell you, Mr. Chairman, if the workmen were without the ballot we would have free trade within twelve months, and their protests and ours would be as idle as the wind which none of us heed. Fortunately for them they have a vote, and if they fail to use it for their homes, and their firesides, and their families they will show much less manhood, independence, intelligence, and righteous resentment than I am sure they possess. It was the ballot in the hands of labor to be used next November which kept coal and iron ore from being placed on the free-list in this bill, and unless the majority is reversed in this body and the Fifty-first Congress placed under Republican control these products, with others of equal importance, will be stricken from the dutiable and placed upon the free-list. This is only the initial step. The chairman of the committee has so declared. Listen to his words found in his opening speech:

We should lay taxes to obtain revenue, but not restrict importations. * * * We should place every material of manufacture on the free-list. * * *

This is the proclamation made by the premier of this body; this is in direct line with the President's message; this is the plan, the policy, and the purpose of the Democratic party. The elections once safely over, the party now in control again invested with power, and the work will go on to the end. The Democratic patriots and protectionists must get out of the way. Even Democrats who believe that protection is "a local issue," and as such worth maintaining, must not further in-

interrupt the procession. You saw an exhibition of the spirit this morning [laughter], when the generous courtesy of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] saved his party from a most unfortunate embarrassment. The hope of the country, Mr. Chairman, is in the ballot. The future, and, as I conceive, the welfare and progress of the Republic, the future condition of the wage-earners depends upon the issue to be settled in November. American citizens who love their country must be on guard on that day of supreme concern; it is their day, their one great opportunity. Parties must be subordinated to the great interests of the masses. No party necessity is great enough to force its adherents against its country's best interests. I care not what in the future may be the party name which stands for this system, which stands for the people, I will follow its flag under whatever designation or leadership, because it is my country's flag and represents its greatness and its glory.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I conclude and thank you for your kind attention and for the generous indulgence of the House. [Long and continued applause, and cries of "Vote!"]

I desire to print in the RECORD a letter received from the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers:

[National Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers of the United States, general office, Nos. 512 and 514 Smithfield street.]

PITTSBURGH, PA., May 14, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully ask you to submit to the Fifth Congress the following statement of the importations of iron and steel for the year ending June 30, 1887, and its relation to labor. The quantities imported are of various grades, and the calculations made are for the number of men that could have been employed in and about our rolling mills had that amount of iron and steel been manufactured in the United States:

The items have been taken from the Report of Commerce and Navigation for 1887. It has been estimated as near as could be done to give a fair average of the number of men in each item that it would require directly at the furnaces and trains of rolls to make the amount of iron and steel as enumerated in the following clauses:

First. The amount of scrap imported was 261,268 tons. If this amount had not been brought over, and had been made out of pig-iron into muck bar in our mills it would have given employment to about seventeen hundred and forty puddlers and helpers, each day of three hundred days in a year. It would also have given employment to many others at the muck rolls rolling it into bars before it could be used at the finishing trains and worked into finished product ready for the market. The number of men herein specified does not include the miners of ore and coal or those employed at blast furnaces, foundries, machine shops, etc., which are necessary in order to make this material.

Second. Bar and structural iron and steel, also billets, slabs, blooms, and ingots imported during the year amounted to about 275,000 tons. This would have given employment to at least 1,000 men per day in and about steel mills in getting it in shape for the different departments that make it ready for the market, or into a merchantable article. Again, it would require and give employment to fifteen hundred men working in the iron mills in which the iron and steel is reworked and made into a finished article. This is in addition to the one thousand already mentioned.

Third. The importation of cotton-ties, hoops, bands, and scrolls of iron and steel was in the neighborhood of 19,800 tons. This amount would have given employment to two hundred and fifty men per day, at three hundred days per year.

The cotton-ties especially have given cause to considerable trouble among the men employed in mills making a specialty of cotton ties. Because of the ad valorem rate of 35 per cent, we have almost every year to contend with a reduction in the price per ton of the imported article that caused prices to be established here from which the American manufacturer and workman suffered alike. The Mills bill provides that cotton-ties be placed on the free-list. We positively object, as such action will deprive our workmen of the opportunity of making the limited amount of cotton-ties they now make, and in addition, it will very materially injure our hoop-iron trade. When cotton-ties were admitted under a specific duty, the unit of value was a fraction over 2 cents per pound. Since the introduction of the ad valorem rate, the unit of value has declined every year, until now it is 1.2 cents per pound.

Fourth. Plates, sheets, and corrugated iron and steel was imported in various forms amounting to about 23,300 tons. That amount would have given work to three hundred men each day of three hundred days in the year, and, as already stated, to many others in preparing the material from which sheets and plates are manufactured. Sheet steel, we understand, has been imported during the past year at 45 per cent. ad valorem. We claim that this is a gross injustice on our steel workers, as the duty on sheet steel should be no less than that on sheet iron of the same sizes. We claim that ad valorem rates should be eliminated from the lists of imports, as it admits of undervaluations and fraud. You need no further proof of this than the fact that 30 gauge sheet iron is admitted at a lower rate than the heavier gauges, yet the cost of production of the former exceeds that of the latter.

Fifth. Wire rods, nails, screws, and wire in various shapes was imported to the amount of about 150,000 tons. This amount would have given employment to at least thirty-seven hundred men per year.

Sixth. Nuts, washers, bolts, and railway fish-plates, or splice-bars, steel tire for railway purposes, including hinge iron and tubes of steel, were imported to the amount of about 50,000 tons, to manufacture which eight hundred men would have been employed three hundred days in a year, had such been manufactured in this country instead of abroad.

The number of men that could have been steadily employed here in making the above amount of products a livelihood for themselves and their families can be readily estimated. Therefore, should the Mills bill pass, which provides for a still further reduction of duties on iron and steel, it would certainly augment the importation of such manufactured articles, and would therefore cause more idleness and suffering among the working classes, who have already been affected since the measure was introduced in the present session of Congress.

There was also imported over 49,500 tons of iron and steel rails. The Mills bill proposes to take off the present duty \$6 per ton, thereby leaving the duty only \$11 per ton. Taking into consideration the amount that was imported, such a reduction as proposed by the bill would have a tendency to still further increase importations, and would be the cause of throwing hundreds of more men into idleness than are merely getting a living now in the mills manufacturing rails.

The 49,500 tons would have given at least five hundred men employment for the entire year in addition to those producing the material to make the same into rails.

In the foregoing statement we have dealt with none in a numerical sense, ex-

cept those directly employed in and about rolling mills and steel works. We have not included the millions who are benefited by the product of our labor, not the least of whom is the farmer. Our hard-earned earnings ramify through them all—the grocer, butcher, baker, broker, lawyer, insurance agent, real estate agent, banker, merchant, in fact every kind of business derives a benefit from the brawn and muscle of the physical laborer—and any reduction therefrom means a corresponding reduction all around.

Again, we desire to call your attention to the manufacture of tin-plated. The Mills bill places tin-plated on the free-list. Whatever professions of friendship and partiality to American labor the majority of the Ways and Means Committee may have made, this act of theirs in placing tin-plated on the free-list clearly indicates their real intentions of ultimate free-trade. It is an act solely and absolutely in the interest of British capital and labor, securing to them a monopoly of tin-plate manufacture needed to supply the needs and wants of the American people. It is an act that implies the inability of American labor to produce tin-plated, or that it is better to employ British labor at low wages to supply us with tin plates, rather than permit the same to be done by home labor at reasonable wages.

It is unnecessary that we should enter here into the history of the tin-plate question in this country. Suffice it to say that although strenuous attempts were made between 1872 and 1878 to establish tin-plate manufacture in this country, all failed for lack of proper encouragement by the Government. A protective tariff was never enforced for the purpose of promoting tin-plate manufacture here.

British manufacturers, though possessing a monopoly of tin-plate manufacture since 1720, never supplied cheap tin-plated to this country until attempts to manufacture tin-plated were made here. In 1875 we had four tin-plate works in operation in this country. Prices of British tin-plated were very high up to that date. Quoting from the Iron Age, we find the prices to have been, in 1873, for ordinary coke grades, \$12 per box, and for charcoal grades \$14.75 per box. A box contained 112 sheets of 14 by 20, and weighed about 112 pounds. It was the high prices that had existed up to this time that tempted American capital to undertake tin-plate manufacturing. The duty at that time was 15 per cent. ad valorem. In 1875 the duty was made specific, 1.1 cents per pound; but it was only a low revenue duty, equal to about 15 per cent. ad valorem. The British manufacturers finding that the attempts to manufacture tin-plated in this country were successful rapidly reduced prices, and by the aid of cheap labor and a low tariff in 1878 completely throttled the young American industry. Since this little episode took place we have had an era of low prices and an extremely poor quality of tin-plated.

As workmen we reason that if British manufacturers were enabled to throttle this young industry by the aid of a low revenue tariff, that the same results would follow in bars, sheets, structural, and all other forms of iron and steel manufacture, had we not a protective duty.

The low revenue tariff on tin-plated, which also includesterne plates, have furthermore been very injurious to our sheet-iron and steel industry. For several years the imported tin and terne plates have been steadily displacing home productions of sheets of the finer grades, particularly galvanized and leaded sheets in several directions. In the roofing business the quantity of home-produced sheet-iron has fallen off within the last six years nearly one-half. If these results have followed from a low tariff, what may we expect to follow in the wake of free tin-plated? It is reasonable to presume nothing less than the complete annihilation of the sheet-iron and steel business in all the finer grades.

The arguments used by a majority of the Ways and Means Committee in favor of free tin-plated seem to us very illogical and impracticable. They make but one point, to wit: Cheaper cans to promote the export trade in canned goods. This is ridiculous, as the law now provides a drawback of 90 per cent. off of the duty to the exporter. The remaining 10 per cent. affects the price of a dozen 3-pound cans of salmon about 1 cent. Just imagine an item of 1 cent per dozen cans of salmon giving the exporter such an advantage in the foreign market as would effectually overcome all competition.

The majority report does not show that free tin plates would be any advantage to the home consumer of canned goods. Nor can canners expect any advantage, as the tax is not paid by them, but by the consumer of canned goods. For this reason we fail to comprehend why canners are agitating lower duties on tin plates or free tin plates.

Importers and such large users of tin plates as the Standard Oil Company are naturally in favor of free tin-plated. There are quite a number of importers who are interested as owners of the tin-plate works—Henry, Nash & Co., Bond & Parsons, Sims & Coventry, Taylor Brothers, Phelps, Dodge & Co., and others. We readily admit that to these free tin-plated would be quite an advantage.

British manufacturers would also expect to realize some benefit from the free tin-plated. For over eight years they have been constantly complaining of the low price of tin-plated in the United States. It must be observed that the agitation for a protective tariff and home production of tin-plated has had its moral effect, in a large measure at least, of keeping down the price of the article in our markets. Let free trade in tin-plated be established, and the agitation in favor of protection and home production ceases. It is but natural to suppose that British manufacturers, finding themselves absolutely masters of the situation, will so materially advance prices to a point at least satisfactory to themselves.

It is therefore evident to our minds that the real beneficiaries of free tin-plated would be the foreign producers of the article, foreign merchants, and importers.

To the American workman and chief consumer no material benefit whatever would accrue. On the other hand as wage-earners our workmen would be greatly injured. In the name of the iron and steel workers, we therefore protest against the action of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee in placing tin-plated on the free-list, or against any reduction in the present duty.

We go further, and earnestly petition Congress to seriously meditate as to the advisability of placing a protective duty on tin-plated, a duty commensurate with the higher labor cost in this country; thus securing employment to American labor, in the production of tin-plated, at wages in harmony with those now existing in our iron and steel manufacturing.

For the purpose of fully demonstrating this matter we submit herewith a cost sheet, showing comparative cost of production of tin-plated in this country and Great Britain. We have taken great care in preparing this cost sheet, and as it is a new feature in the presentation of this subject we hope you will give it careful study and consideration.

The effect of placing a protective duty on tin-plate will not have the effect, as some people argue, of raising the price in proportion to the increase in duty. The increase in price will be really immaterial. It should be observed that under our present system of having all our tin plates manufactured abroad, that a large expense is incurred between manufacturer and consumer. This, with home production, would be absorbed in higher wages to labor.

The value at the port of export of the tin-plated imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, was \$16,883,813. The average price of tin-plated for last year, paid by the American consumers, not including the Standard Oil Company, and a few other large corporations, was about 5.2 cents per pound. Our total importation last year would thus indicate a value of nearly \$30,000,000.

The cost of production of the tin-plated, according to the cost sheet we submit, would be \$15,877,623, in Great Britain, and in this country \$23,267,982. This indicates that with home production the price to the consumer would be advanced but very little over present rates.

The advantages to the home market, however, would be immense. The total

wages paid to British labor in the manufacture of tin-plates imported last year was about \$8,991,468. American wages for same amount of work would be \$20,352,875.

This increase in employment furnished to labor would more than remove the glut in the labor market. It would create such a demand for labor as to give employment to every idle iron and steel worker in the country.

It would also stimulate labor in the production of coal, iron, ore, coke, limestone, and other materials. The 254,751 gross tons of tin-plates represent 870,000

tons of iron ore, 300,000 tons of limestone, 1,800,000 tons of coal and coke, 360,000 tons of pig-iron, 5,000,000 pounds of lead, 25,000,000 pounds of tin, 12,000,000 pounds of tallow or palm-oil, 35,000,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, 11,000,000 feet of lumber, fire-brick, clay, oils and lubricants, hemp, etc.

It would require sixty-eight large works of five trains of rolls each, involving an outlay of over \$30,000,000 capital, and giving employment to about 24,000 workmen in the rolling-mills alone, who would earn at least \$12,000,000 per annum.

Comparative cost of the manufacture of black plates of ordinary quality in iron or steel at a Welsh tin-plate works, and the like at an American works, at wage rates paid in each country.

[In Great Britain there are 94 works, with a capacity of 376 mills, or 4 mills to each works. English works make 30 boxes per day. Welsh works 35 and 40 boxes. Weekly average per mill, 11 turns, 400 boxes. Total for 4 mills, 1,600 boxes per week, or 80,000 boxes in a year, 17 boxes to the ton.]

	English rates.	American rates.	English earnings.	American earnings.	Cost per box in England.	Cost per box in United States.
BLACK PLATE DEPARTMENT.						
Steel or iron bar, per ton.....	\$24.60	\$38.00	Per day.	Per day.	\$1.44 ⁷ / ₈	\$2.23 ¹ / ₂
Roller,* per box.....	.06 ¹ / ₂	.23	\$2.27	\$8.05	.06 ¹ / ₂	.23
Catcher, per box.....	.02 ¹ / ₂		.87		.02 ¹ / ₂	
Doubler, per box.....	.05 ¹ / ₂	.11	1.92	3.85	.05 ¹ / ₂	.11
Furnaceman, per box.....	.05	.10	1.75	3.50	.05	.10
Opener, per box.....	.01 ¹ / ₂	.05	.52	1.75	.01 ¹ / ₂	.05
Shearer and assistants,† per box.....	.02 ³ / ₈	.11	6.44	30.80	.02 ³ / ₈	.11
Annealers,‡ per box.....	.03 ³ / ₈	.12	10.13	32.00	.03 ³ / ₈	.12
Pickling, patent process in England.....	.03 ³ / ₈	.17			.03 ³ / ₈	.17
Cold rolling room:						
Oreman.....			17.20	125.00		
Boys rolling.....			.40	1.25		
Catching.....			.28	1.10		
Greasing.....			.20	.75		
Attending.....			.28	1.10		
On contract work 10s. (\$2.40) per 100 boxes in England.....	.02 ³ / ₈	.09			.02 ³ / ₈	.09
One man weighing black plate.....			1.00	2.00	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.00 ⁷ / ₈
Doublers, bundlers, 32 cents per 100 boxes.....						
Finishers, 40 cents per 100 boxes.....	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.02			.00 ⁷ / ₈	.02
Two men assorting in annealing room.....	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂	.80	2.00	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂
Foreman and roll-turner.....			14.40	125.00	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂
Mason (bricklayer).....			1.44	3.00		
Blacksmith.....			1.32	2.75		
Helper.....			.72	1.50	.01 ¹ / ₈	.02 ³ / ₈
Millwright for repairs.....			1.44	3.00	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂
Watchman.....			.72	1.25		
Two engineers, each.....			1.20	2.50		
Two helpers, each.....			.84	1.75		
One man wheeling shearings.....			.80	1.60	.02 ³ / ₈	.05 ¹ / ₂
Sunday repairs, castings, bricks, clay, etc.....					.02	.04
Sulphuric acid, c £5, or hydro-chloric, c £3 per ton, 1c H, 8 H.....					.08	.18
Coal for boilers, annealing and mill, 30 tons per day.....					.13 ¹ / ₂	.13 ¹ / ₂
Annealing pots and stands.....					.01 ¹ / ₂	.02
Total.....					2.19 ¹ / ₂	3.74 ¹ / ₂
Credit shearings, 20 pounds per box.....					.10	.18
Net cost per box of black plate.....					2.69 ¹ / ₂	3.56 ¹ / ₂
TINNING DEPARTMENT.						
Tinman, 35 boxes per day, per box.....	.06	.12	2.10	4.20	.06	.12
Washman, 35 boxes per day, per box.....	.06	.12	2.10	4.20	.06	.12
Grease-boy, 35 boxes per day, per box.....	.02	.04	.70	1.40	.02	.04
Branning, \$1.44 per 100 boxes.....						
Dusting, \$1.08 per 100 boxes.....	.02 ¹ / ₂	.05			.02 ¹ / ₂	.05
One man wheeling plates and lighting fires.....			.80	1.25	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.00 ⁷ / ₈
Assorters:						
First hand.....			1.40	2.80		
Two second hands.....			1.32	2.65	.01 ¹ / ₈	.02 ³ / ₈
Reckoning.....			.40	.80	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.00 ⁷ / ₈
Boxing and branding boxes, \$1.38 per 100 boxes.....			1.90	2.80	.01 ¹ / ₈	.02 ³ / ₈
Foreman of tin house.....			14.40	125.00	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂
Bricklayer for repairing pots.....			1.44	3.00		
Smith and machinist.....			1.32	2.75		
Helper.....			.72	1.50	.01 ¹ / ₈	.02 ³ / ₈
Storekeeper.....			.80	1.60		
Laborer attending to fire.....			.80	1.25		
Boy driving small engine.....			.32	.65	.00 ⁷ / ₈	.01 ¹ / ₂
Lumber, boxes for packing plates.....					.08	.08
Stoves, nails, hemp, skins, brushes, etc.....					.04	.04
Welsh flux, acid process.....					.04	
Palm-oil flux, 1 ¹ / ₂ pound.....						.10 ³ / ₈
Coal for melting pots.....					.00 ¹ / ₂	.00 ¹ / ₂
Block tin on Welsh plates, 2 ¹ / ₂ pounds.....					.55	
Block tin on American plates, 3 ¹ / ₂ pounds.....						.70
Bran for cleaning plates.....					.00 ¹ / ₂	.01
Castings for repairs of tinning pots.....					.00 ¹ / ₂	.01
Lamp oil for lighting.....					.00 ³ / ₈	.00 ³ / ₈
Tinning royalty on patent rolls.....						.12
General charges.						
Banker's commission.....	\$2,500	\$5,000				
Rents, taxes, etc.....	1,500	1,500				
Manager's salary.....	1,500	3,000				
Bookkeepers.....	750	1,500				
Pay and yield clerk.....	500	1,000				
General clerk.....	400	800				
	7,150	12,800			.08 ³ / ₈	.16
Total.....					3.13 ¹ / ₂	5.25
Credit copperas and tin-scuff.....					.08	.12
Net cost of 1 box I C plates, 14 by 20.....					3.05 ¹ / ₂	5.13

* The "roller" pays the "catcher" in the United States.

† Paid for product of four mills in both countries.

‡ Per week.

We could elaborate on this subject still more, but we feel that we are encroaching upon your valuable time. What is herein given we can substantiate. Our people are no theorists in their line. They are men who by dint of hard physical labor (labor that has made it possible to encircle this country with a complete network of iron and steel), energy, experience, suffering, and hardships have become thoroughly practical. Our condition as workmen is such that requires legislation—for our betterment, not for our detriment, which the passage of the Mills bill will make possible. Some will argue that our employers will reduce our wages anyway, even though the tariff remains as it is. We ask you to leave that to us, and we will endeavor to take care of ourselves. As is customary in all branches of business, even among lawyers, we have our little family quarrels, but we dislike outsiders to interfere in the settlement thereof.

We mean no disrespect to any one when we say that we look upon this yearly agitation of the tariff as a menace to our business, though, perhaps, unintended. As an organization we have strenuously and persistently opposed any concerted political action. We never have and do not now owe allegiance to any political party. We know neither Republicans, Democrats, Greenbackers, Prohibitionists, Union Labor, or any other known political party in the United States. In the opening ceremony in our lodge meetings we forbid "the introduction of any subject of a political nature." We simply quote this to show that we have never dabbled in politics as an organization.

We have never contributed \$1 or 1 cent toward electing or defeating any party or any man, and we ask Congress not to force us into that position by passing a bill that will undoubtedly jeopardize our wages. While every member in our organization is free to and does exercise his political preference, we are protectionists and have unanimously declared ourselves such as an organization at almost every recurring annual convention.

All parties directly or indirectly interested in or against protection were refused hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and we have no method of reaching the ears of the members of Congress only in this way. We therefore submit this statement through you, and ask for it a respectful hearing to the end that we may be allowed through the medium of protection against foreign competition to maintain decent living wages.

Accompanying this, please find a copy of our "scale of prices" for reference in case of dispute.

Yours respectfully, and on behalf of the iron and steel workers,

WILLIAM WEIHE,
President.
WILLIAM MARTIN,
Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when Congress assembled last December there had been purchased all of the bonds which were necessary to complete the required sum for the sinking fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888. There had accumulated in the Treasury a surplus of about \$55,000,000, and the daily sum collected by taxation was about \$1,000,000, so that it was estimated that the surplus remaining unexpended on July 1, 1888, would be not less than \$150,000,000. The Forty-eighth and the Forty-ninth Congresses had refused to consider any act reducing taxation; and the Secretary of the Treasury was not willing, under the act of March 3, 1881, to purchase bonds not required for the sinking fund.

When the Committee on Ways and Means was announced, on January the 5th, it necessarily had to confront this condition of affairs and attempt to frame a bill which would so reduce the revenues of the Government as to bring its legitimate expenses and its revenues close together; and this, too, in such a way as to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people. It recognized that the revenues could be reduced by raising the duties to a prohibitory standard—but this only increased the burdens of taxation.

The repeal of the entire internal-revenue law would also reduce the revenue to a point where there might be an annual deficit of \$20,000,000; but this deficit could not work harm for the present, as the surplus remaining on June 30, 1888, would be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the sinking fund until 1891, when the four-and-a-halves fall due. But no large section of the American people really favored a plan which removed taxation from spirits, beer, and tobacco, and left the necessities of life burdened; nor was the committee willing, in the assorting of taxes and in the attempt to give substantial relief from the present unnecessary taxation, to adopt a plan which did not light a single furnace, cause a single wheel to revolve, give to labor a single day's wage, remove from commercial activity any burden, nor from the manufacturer any annoyance. This plan simply took from the public Treasury that amount of taxes which were voluntarily paid in a mode which distributed those taxes equally, impartially, and not by burdens upon the necessities of life.

Rejecting, therefore, the proposition to increase the duties for the purpose of reducing the revenues of the Government and increasing the revenues of the manufacturers, and the proposition to repeal the internal-revenue system, the committee attempted to frame a bill which would reduce the revenues by a safe amount, and would relieve, as far as a moderate bill could do, the evils of the present unequal system; reform the inequalities of the present tariff, and promote American industry by giving to American labor the hope of a permanent, stable, and profitable market. It recognized that a system which had been in existence for over a quarter of a century could not be hastily nor recklessly overturned. It desired to harm no industry. It constantly leaned in favor of the established rates of duty, and in case of doubt proposed a rate which it believed to be entirely safe.

No one can appreciate more than we that the bill reported by us does not answer all the conditions of to-day; that many duties are left at a rate entirely too high; that the relief which ought to be given has not been granted to the extent which the condition of the country and of labor required; but I venture to affirm that under all the circumstances which surrounded us—trying to perform an onerous public duty with

an eye single to the public good—we have reported a bill which every fair-minded man in America may accept as wise, moderate, and proper legislation. And upon this statement, for one, I am willing to go to the country and to submit to its judgment. [Applause on the Democratic side].

And here it may not be improper to notice the personal criticism on this committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

With a wit which was equalled by the courtesy and much greater than the desire for accuracy exhibited, the gentleman from Michigan insinuated, what he would not be reckless enough to directly assert, that not only was the bill reported not prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means which reported it, but that,

When pressed upon this point, there was no member of the majority so lost to all sense of personal pride as to admit the parentage.

And this statement is introduced with the assertion of the gentleman that—

It would be no violation of the secrets of the committee-room to state that.

I trust that it is within the most rigorous bounds of parliamentary language to say that this is absolutely without foundation; in its length, breadth, height, depth, and thickness it is a creation of the gentleman's fancy, except that he violated no secrets of the committee-room in making the statement; what he violated I leave to him to determine. [Applause and laughter].

At no meeting in that committee-room or elsewhere, at no time or place, in no manner whatever has the majority of that committee ever given any one any pretence to say that it denied its responsibility for this bill, or that any one but the members of that majority was in any degree whatever responsible for it.

Of course any bill not in whole or in part prepared by the gentleman from Michigan would fail to meet his approbation, for it is the pleasing belief of gentlemen of his opinion that they alone are competent to prepare tariff bills; and if it were possible for Job to return and ask that olden question which puzzled the depth and the sea, "Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" the modest gentleman from Michigan, either alone or in company with some of his colleagues, would feel constrained by the irresistible sense of duty and of fitness to rise and with downcast eye but firm demeanor and hand resting on his manly breast answer, "here!" [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side].

There need be no denial on the part of the minority of the committee of complicity in the preparation of any bill reducing the amount of bonus paid by the tax-payer and consumer to the favored beneficiaries of class legislation. It goes without the saying that they are guiltless of such offense. And it is true that in the preparation of this bill we did not hope to meet their wishes, receive their approbation, or find their support of the provisions agreed on by us. We disagree *in toto*. We believe that taxation is a sovereign power to be used only to the extent of public necessity and for governmental purposes; they believe it ought to be used for private interests and the promotion of private gain.

With us the burden of proof is on him who seeks to insert rates of duties in a tax bill to demonstrate that the revenue is necessary and that the tax is a proper one; they believe that the burden is on the tax-payer to demonstrate that no private profit will be lost by removing a public tax. With such opposite views it is the merest folly to suppose that it were possible for that committee to agree upon a tax bill.

But it is proper that this House and the country should know, what I doubt not is known, that this bill was the result of great labor, of an earnest desire to reach a fair and conservative compromise measure; and that every item of it underwent the scrutiny of every member of the majority of the committee. As a whole it is a compromise of independent and earnest opinions of earnest men bent on practical legislation. [Applause].

It does not pretend to change a system, to set aside the present system and substitute in lieu of it another and different system. It leaves the average rates of duty higher than they were under the Morrill tariff, and it is a protective-tariff bill. The committee did not believe that it was its duty to do more than to propose a moderate reduction of taxation by increasing the free-list, reducing certain rates, and removing as far as practicable unnecessary restrictions, and to make an effort to render the administration of the law more efficient to the protection of honest importers and the detection and prevention of fraud.

Whatever views any one may hold as to the proper theory on which a tariff bill ought to be framed, those views are not violated by this bill. We do not pretend that it is a scientific measure. The present law is very highly protective—in some instances prohibitory. He who believes that protection ought to be the main object and revenue only incidental may find it to his interest to accept so moderate an offer as is now made; he who thinks that in raising the revenues such incidental protection ought to be given as is practicable will find in the provisions of this proposition, when he examines them carefully, that his support of this measure would be consistent with his opinions. While men of my views, content with trying to accomplish what is practicable and patiently watching the fair experiment of reducing taxation and increasing the free-list by putting thereon raw material, ac-

cept the practical and give our support. It is a bill framed to meet the present condition, not to fit any particular theory.

The bill reported affects the schedules under which there were importations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, to the value of \$258,208,157.11, on which were collected \$139,852,632.62 of duties, and it is estimated that the aggregate reduction of duties caused by the changes proposed in this bill will amount to \$53,720,447.22. This estimate is, of course, conjectural. The reduction of rates sometimes produces increased importations, and in certain articles affected by the proposed changes this may occur. So, too, increase of population brings increase of consumption, and larger importations are needed to supply this increased demand. On the contrary, it is believed that this bill will enable the home manufacturer of woolen and other textile fabrics to so equally compete with his foreign competitor as to supply the home market with much of what is now supplied by importation, and that this will continue until the foreign goods of certain characters will be entirely driven from the American market.

We have no doubt that with the superior skill, intelligence, and machinery under the control of our manufacturers, that all that is necessary to secure for them the home market is that they shall be put on equal terms with the foreign competitor. We have kept steadily in view the fundamental principle of all true national growth—that there is no hostility between the man who produces the material out of which the fabrics must be made, the labor by which the change from raw material to finished product is accomplished, the manufacturer under whose supervision and by means of whose capital this change is made, and the consumer for whose benefit and at whose cost all this is done. Inextricably intermingled, there are no classes under a proper and natural system of development.

The changes proposed by this bill are designed to give to the farmer by whom all provisions are raised a market for his breadstuffs and for raw materials, which is only profitable when he has a prosperous manufacturer for a purchaser; to the laborer, the hope of a constant market; and to the manufacturer, freedom from unnecessary burdens. We have, therefore, put upon the free-list, as far as we felt it was just, the materials necessary for the manufacturer. We have reduced the rates, wherever we have touched them, to a point that gives to the home consumer the hope of fair competition whenever a demand may be made by an internal trust to advance the prices beyond a fair consideration for the article to be sold, and yet we have left the rates so that the protection afforded is greater than any necessity, and makes all competition of foreign manufactures upon terms of great advantage to the American manufacturer. We do not believe there is a single instance in the bill where the duty left upon an article is not more than the difference between the cost of production in America and the cost of production abroad, plus the freight. When the bill is examined in detail, I think this will be found to be true, and I remit the discussion of the details of the bill until it be taken up, item by item, under the five-minute rule.

But I will illustrate that this is accurate by a mere reference to the cotton schedule:

The last authoritative compilation and analysis concerning the cotton manufacturing interest of the United States was prepared by Mr. Edward Atkinson, an eminent practical expert, as the agent of the Tenth Census.

In the census year the cotton-mills of the United States consumed 1,570,344 bales of cotton, which cost \$55.39 a bale, and sold the product at the rate of \$122.32 per bale, the aggregate cost of the cotton being \$86,957,235, and of other material \$15,260,622, and the aggregate proceeds of the product were \$192,090,110.

The mills paid \$42,040,510 for the services of operatives and all other employees. The cost of labor was 21.28 per cent. of the value of the product, and 41.13 per cent. of the value of the cotton and all other raw material consumed.

The cost of the raw material of all kinds and wages was \$144,246,857, and the product was sold for \$192,090,110, leaving a credit balance of \$32,156,747, which seems to include, though not so stated, the cost of insurance, interest, and selling, as those items are not charged in the account balance-sheet.

The cost of labor was 21.28 per cent.; the proposed duty is from 35 to 40 per cent., being from 175 to almost 200 per cent. on the labor. But, in addition to this enormous advantage, the English manufacturer has to pay freight on the cotton exported from America, which is about 12 per cent. on the material, and freight on his finished product, which is 12 per cent. on the fabric, and it is fair to estimate this double freight at 18 per cent. To this must be added the double marine insurance and the additional cost of the increased handlings necessary, and to this the increased productivity of the American laborer.

The rates proposed and the changes recommended ought to meet the approval of the gentlemen from Massachusetts, for they are even higher than those advocated by Henry Wilson and approved by Charles Sumner in 1857 (Globe, Thirty-fourth Congress, third session, volume 35, page 343), and of the gentlemen from Ohio, for they are far above what Senator SHEEMAN declared in 1867 (Globe, volume 63, part 3, appendix, page 71, second session of Thirty-ninth Congress) was sufficient. Let me submit to the distinguished Representative from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY] what his no less distinguished Senator then said—

We must now protect American manufacturers, not merely against foreign competition, but also against the effect of our own laws. This is really all the protection they now need.

*** If you reduce their products to a specie basis, and put them on the same footing they were on before the war, the present rates of duty would be too high. It would not be necessary for scarce any branch of industry to be protected to the extent of your present tariff law.

They do not ask protection against the pauper labor of Europe, but they ask protection against the violation of your own laws. These are our paper currency and our internal taxation.

You have repealed every burden imposed on the manufacturer under the internal taxation except as to alcohol, and we are on a specie basis; and yet you asseverate, with a display of intense passion, that a bill proposing changes so much more moderate is, in its conception British, in its design unpatriotic, and in its effects fatal. Gentlemen, how do you expect the country to believe that you are sincere when they contrast your utterances with those of the statesmen who were your leaders?

It was determined, in response to what seemed to be the sentiment of a large part of the country, to propose the repeal of taxes on manufactured tobacco. For practical statesmanship is the art of wise compromise, and in a free country the desire and judgment of a large portion of the people whom we represent must be accepted as a sufficient reason for legislation.

In the twenty-five years in which the internal-revenue system has been in force certain statutes have been found to admit of an administration which is oppressive and irritating. The committee have thought it wise to repeal so much of these statutes as were not necessary to the proper administration of the system and the collection of the revenue under it. We propose the repeal of special retail licenses, the revenues from which we do not need, which licenses we do not believe to be necessary to the administration of the law and the collection of the remaining revenues, and which are a continual source of oppression and irritation, as is shown by the fact that more than 50 per cent. of all the prosecutions in the Federal courts are for the alleged violation of those provisions of the statute which are proposed to be repealed.

It is also proposed to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to make an experiment as to whether the revenues upon distilled spirits may be collected in a simpler and less expensive manner than under the present statute—as to whether the army of office-holders required by the present system can not be either greatly curtailed or wholly discharged. It is not made mandatory upon him, because the committee was not willing to force the Executive to try this experiment, but they did desire not only that he should have the opportunity so to do but that he should take advantage thereof. The present system is largely based upon the hypothesis that every one who manufactures spirits, beer, or tobacco is dishonest, and is to be watched as if he were intent upon defrauding the Government. It is believed that a system ought to be, and can be devised based upon precisely the opposite hypothesis, and this law permits the Secretary to make an experiment with the smaller distilleries if he chooses so to do.

There were reasons which made the committee examine with the utmost care whether it is practicable to exempt fruit brandies and alcohol used in the arts from taxation without destroying the legitimate distillation of taxed spirits; and no provision could be framed which seemed satisfactory—no provision that practically exempted these spirits on the one hand and yet was at all just to those who obeyed the law as to other spirits, or secured the collection of the revenue on the spirits taxed. Our belief was that to exempt fruit brandies and alcohol used in the arts was indirectly and hypocritically, but effectually, to destroy the internal-revenue system; and if this is to be done we preferred to do it or have it done openly, and thus fix the responsibility for it upon those who accomplished it. Those who vote to exempt alcohol thus used will do so with the knowledge that it is a vote to destroy the tax on distilled spirits.

The aggregate amount of reduction is estimated to be \$78,176,054.22, taken in nearly the proportion of 2 to 1 from tariff taxation and internal-revenue taxation.

This reduction, of course, does not affect the surplus now in the Treasury. As to that the policy which the committee has desired to be pursued, and which under the bill reported by it and amended in the Senate, and under the resolution passed by this House on the 16th of April, has been inaugurated by the Secretary of the Treasury since this discussion began, is that the payment of the public debt with the surplus which has accumulated, and which will continue to accumulate, ought to be the settled policy of the Government. And as to the future the reduction of taxation by the removal of burdens through a revision of the tariff is the policy through which alone the Democratic party can hope to retain the confidence of the country.

The bill is before Congress; the responsibility of its preparation was upon us; the responsibility of legislation is upon you. No sneers as to its authors; no charges, however offensive or discourteous, as to the manner of its preparation; no abuse of those who were concerned in its preparation can remove from you the responsibility of action nor change the issue made by the bill itself. The surplus continues to grow; the evil effects of it are daily exhibited; schemes without number to squander the public money, to distribute it among the States, to cultivate a habit in the American people of looking to Washington as a great alms-giver can be defeated only by your action as to this bill. And it is no answer to say that it was prepared in secrecy, that its authors are incompetent, that there was impropriety in the mode of its consideration. Neither your own consciences nor the country will acquit you if you shirk the responsibility and evade the issue under such excuse. Nor will it be accepted as any answer that there was any provision of any sort in the

Confederate constitution, or that the gentlemen engaged in the preparation of this bill were on one side or the other side during that great strife, or that certain States have lagged behind in the progress of national growth. It might as well be understood that what we do and say here is done and said in view of the American people, who are in dead earnest concerning this matter.

It has been reported that in some savage tribes, out of the bones of the dead, implements of various sorts were made; but in this debate it has occurred to gentlemen so eminent as to be distinguished representatives of the people to deliberately dig up the bones of the heroes of the great war and out of them make dice, and loaded dice at that, to play in this game of politics. In such a game, even with such dice, the gentleman using them may rest assured that they will lose. The American people are in no humor either to witness or approve such proceedings.

The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania may also be assured that no criticism he may permit himself to make upon Kentucky will be held to be any answer to the bill under consideration, or any excuse for refusal to give relief to the people, overburdened by excessive taxation and looking to this Congress for some wise legislation. Kentucky can bear with serenity both the commendation and the condemnation of that venerable gentleman, and I beg him to remember that no matter what he may feel called upon to say, he will again be welcome to our hospitality, which will be as generously afforded to him as it has heretofore been; for in his old age we will not remember, if he comes among us, that garrulity which has led him to say things the utterance of which can only harm him and which Kentucky can both forgive and forget.

If the tariff be such a stimulus, if under its operation only prosperity and progress are possible, then the question that he asks—why Kentucky is a laggard—is indeed a mysterious and unanswerable conundrum. If it be equal and just in its operation it becomes a still more mysterious problem, but if it be a carefully-devised system by which those sections which happened to be older and more developed and with larger accumulated capital obtained all the advantages under it, and made all other sections tributary to their gain and profit, then the question, if the implication contained in it were true, is of easy answer. You have obtained by the operation of an unjust law the surplus money which our fields and our mines and our labor have produced. Forced to purchase from you at prices which were wholly beyond the value of the articles purchased, debarred from the markets where we could buy the cheapest, and compelled to sell much of our product in the markets where we had to sell the cheapest, we have been laborers for your benefit; and it is scarcely becoming for you to ask of us why we have not prospered, when your cities have been partly built on our labor and your charities come from exactions laid upon our shoulders.

But while it is true that, relatively, these manufacturing States have grown unequally wealthy, I am confident that they are not as wealthy as they would have been if Carolina and Georgia had not voted for protection in 1816, or Webster had won in the great battle of 1824. The aggregate wealth would have been so much more that their just share thereof would be more than their unjust share under the protection system. It has been a giant moving upwards, but burdened and manacled. The flight has been that of the eagle, but an eagle weighted and trammelled. We took the wrong road in 1824, and surrendered the easy mastery of the world and the unrivaled supremacy of the seas.

It is not, however, true in the sense in which the gentleman asks it, that Kentucky has been laggard. Under the apportionment in 1870 she obtained one additional Representative on this floor, and again, under the apportionment of 1880, she obtained another. From 1870 to 1880, Kentucky increased in population nearly 24 per cent.; Pennsylvania nearly 22 per cent., and New England a little over 15 per cent., so that in spite of unequal laws her growth has been steady, homogeneous, and prosperous, without jealousy of any sister State, and with kindly regard for all sections.

It is true that we have not imported contract labor from Hungary to mine our coal at a price so small that the duty upon it will pay much more than the cost of the mining, and thereby driven the native population from their homes. It is true that we have not used the laws of the land to induce foreigners to settle among us under such contracts as to force the native laborer to work at starvation prices and thereby give to gentlemen in Kentucky the means to found great libraries, or even write valuable books showing the exploits of that "triumphant democracy" through whose delusions such accumulations became possible.

For the convenience of her citizens Kentucky has divided her territory into numerous counties, and the revenue paid by the citizens of some of these counties do not equal the expenditures needed to be disbursed within those counties, and such counties are called "pauper counties," being, however, not a term of reproach nor of poverty. But I felt a pang of pain when the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his blind attack upon Kentucky, spoke of these "pauper" counties, not on my own account, but for my friends, my Republican colleagues from Kentucky [Messrs. THOMAS, HUNTER, and FINLEY], each of whom lives in one of these "pauper" counties, and in these "pauper" counties resides the Republican strength of Kentucky.

Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me to ask,

do not the gentlemen from the First, Second, and Tenth districts represent pauper counties? And are not all of these gentlemen Democrats? Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman refers to Mr. LAFFOON, Mr. TAUBER, and Mr. STONE. I am glad of it, when it puts my friend in such excellent company.

When that speech is read by the citizens of those counties, who have held in affectionate remembrance the name of my venerable friend, they will think, if they do not say, "*El tu, Brute*," and I fear that they will not remember that the last word is in Latin and is a word of two syllables. [Applause.]

The venerable gentleman permits himself to say:

In the midst of almost unparalleled wealth and general physical advantages the mass 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 daily necessities of Northern laborers. In 1880 the number of her people above ten years of age who were reported by the census as unable to read and write were more than one-half of her total population. The number was 606,578, while her total population, which of course included those under ten years of age, numbered 1,163,498.

The venerable gentleman, after the speech of my colleague, Governor MCCREARY, corrected the figures, but did not retract the charges founded upon them; statements far more inaccurate than were the figures; a description so grotesque and exaggerated as to excite only pity for him who could deliberately write and deliberately utter it. It is a fair specimen of the accuracy and fairness of one of the fairest defenders of the present system, and of the temper, animus, and taste of the leader of the Republican House. It harms not the State of whom it is recklessly said.

I hope my Republican colleagues from Kentucky will circulate this speech of their leader over their districts which the gentleman attempts to describe; for he expressly declares of that portion of Kentucky in which I reside, and in which Democratic majorities are given:

Central Kentucky. * * * I may say, is the seat of a more refined and cultivated pastoral community than I have ever been introduced to elsewhere, unless it was in the southern counties of England.

I know not whether the anonymous writers of the extracts read by the gentleman are Kentuckians; if they be, "It is a nasty bird that fouls its own nest."

Mr. Chairman, I venture to submit that in this Congress Kentucky needs no defense; that it is not immodest in her people to hope that her sons in either branch have not been unworthy of her, a fact to which I trust my venerable friend will hereafter feel more like testifying.

But I will not be tempted further; in passing I express the confident belief that the day has gone by when either the passions of the war, denunciations of the whisky ring, abuse of the South, identification of revenue reformers with the Confederate army, or any other of the skillful arts which those interested in the maintenance of this system have heretofore so successfully used, can prevent some action which will be the beginning of a system which is based on the great principle that all tariff legislation should be for the public good and not for private interest.

But I venture to affirm that the gallant Federal soldier who, urged only by a sense of duty, in time of great peril risked his life in retrieving the disaster impending at Shiloh, will hardly be satisfied, when he asks for cheaper clothing and cheaper lumber, to be told that he had fought at Shiloh to settle the question that the Eastern manufacturer had the right to compel the Western consumer to pay such duties as his greed demanded, and that any effort to cheapen the necessities of life by removing therefrom the present exactions would be held to be recognition of the Confederate constitution and the wisdom of that secession. The day has passed when under the old flag, and in the name of loyalty, the sweat of the farmer and the laborer, coined into hard money, can be taken without consideration under the pretense of tariff protection to American labor.

And as I listened to the venerable leader of the House and other eloquent colleagues denouncing the "whisky ring," and pleading in the name of morality for free whisky, and to other gentlemen declaiming with assumed ferocity of manner and exaggeration of rhetorical passion about the late war, the Confederate constitution, and the rebels, I could scarcely repress the hope that the enemies of tariff reform would accept these gentlemen as their leaders, and make up the issue to be tried by the people as they desired. On the one side the payment of the public debt, the reduction of tariff taxation by removing burdens from the necessities of life, and a peaceful rivalry among all sections in building up the future of a united country; on the other side, the squandering of the public money, free whisky, taxed necessities of life to benefit a favored few at the expense of the many, the protection of trusts, and sectional hate.

Representatives of the Republican party, did these gentlemen express your real sentiments? Was the applause with which you greeted their utterances sincere? So be it. We accept the issue, and appeal first to this House to decide, and then to the grand assize of the sovereign people, whose servants we are.

In the year from July 1, 1886, to June 30, 1887, our importations were in value \$683,418,981, of which \$233,093,639 were free of duty and \$450,325,322 dutiable, and the total duty paid was \$214,222,310.

Of the importations of last year, \$245,587,016, under the classifica-

tion adopted by the late distinguished Secretary, Mr. McCulloch, were articles in a crude condition which enter into various processes of domestic industry, and articles wholly or partially manufactured for use as materials in manufactures and mechanic arts. The aggregate duty on this sum was \$39,961,346. Of this sum \$19,567,903 was paid as duty on "articles in a crude condition which enter into the various processes of domestic industry," and \$20,393,493 duty on "articles wholly or partially manufactured for use as materials in the manufactures and mechanic arts." This aggregate sum of \$39,961,396 is not only the protection paid on his material by the American manufacturer for the benefit of the foreign manufacturer in all the markets of the world, but it is much more. It is that much addition to the cost of production upon which he must make his annual profit.

It is that much added to the burden of the consumer, together with all the embarrassments, annoyances, and expenses arising out of a system which in its administration as well as in its rates opens the door to great frauds as against the honest purchaser and importer, and causes trouble to those who are compelled to use these imported materials. This sum is 10 per cent. profit on \$400,000,000; 5 per cent. profit on \$800,000,000 of manufactures. But if it be true that the computation of its real burden is the proportion that it bears to the profit of the manufacturer and not to the cost of production of the product, this prevents the production of far more than \$800,000,000 worth of manufactures. In many of the mills of New England a profit of one-third of one cent on a yard is an ample return upon the capital invested and employed.

This necessary material which we have to import and upon which this burden of forty millions is imposed is in its added cost rendered too expensive to be used in the production of manufactures where the margin of profit is very small. When to the imported material, estimated last year at \$245,587,016, is added the cost of the material, labor, and skill necessary to produce the finished fabric, and to that the necessary cost of handling, transportation, and delivery until the product is actually in the hands of the consumer, the aggregate sum forms a much larger proportion of the seven thousand millions which is estimated to be the annual product of our manufactures than has been ordinarily understood. If it was the last feather that broke the camel's back, the removal of only a very slight part of the precedent load would have enabled that caravan to carry in safety what had been committed to its charge. Every practical man knows that it is not always the largeness of the sum which prevents bankruptcy or which enables him to manufacture in successful competition with his rivals. The mere difference in location, the mere cost of a single as compared with a double handling, the slight advantage in freights, may produce success to one and disaster to another when in all other things as between them there seemed to be equality.

To remove this burden would therefore give a relief far greater than may be calculated by estimating it in relation to the cost of production. It would give new stimulus to many manufactures now languishing—would give profit to many which are now run at a loss, and it would be that small but absolutely necessary sum which marks the difference between profit and loss in the attempt of our manufacturers to compete with the foreign manufacturers in the markets of the world. We talk of subsidies to ships for the purpose of reviving our foreign trade. We spend many millions of dollars a year upon our rivers and harbors for our internal trade so that they may, as far as possible, aid us in our contest for foreign trade. Here is, in its highest sense, a real subsidy that ought to be given to commerce.

To release this forty millions to the producers of America is to enable them to enter on more nearly equal terms with their foreign competitors in all the markets of the world; and as in these latter times it has been discovered that it is the small profit on the large production, and not the large profit on the small production which brings wealth, the larger the output of our factories the cheaper is the cost per unit of production, and the lower therefore the price of the necessities of life to the ultimate consumer.

So, too, this is a direct gift to him who produces in America the materials necessary for our manufactures. The only possible profitable market for him who produces the material upon which more labor and greater skill must be expended to make it useful, is to the manufacturer who is prosperous. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the farmer, who produces such material as comes from the field and stock—the miner and the forest-owner—that we shall adopt such a policy as will give a constant, stable, and profitable market for the material which he must sell in its incomplete state, so that he will be able to buy and pay for the finished product after it has passed through the hands of the manufacturer.

The 265,000,000 pounds of wool raised in America can be turned profitably into the necessities of life which the wool-raiser must purchase only when he has a wool manufacturer who is prosperous and can therefore afford to purchase his material at a fair price. He who from the bowels of the earth digs ore, or mines coal, or from the mountain side or Southern swamp cuts the timber to which the centuries have given life and vigor, must have, if he can make his labor support those who are dependent upon him, some person who can take these

incomplete materials and by added labor and higher skill fit them for the uses to which they were designed, and thereby pay to him a fair price upon which he may always rely, and furnish to him a stable market upon which he may always make his calculations.

The greatest of all products, which in this country must have its daily sale—and that for cash—is labor. Whoever else may retain his goods or wares in barns, or granaries, or warehouses, he who has naught but labor must sell it, and that for cash, so that the daily bread which depends upon the daily wage can be given to those whom God has put upon him to support. Competition can alone furnish a profitable market for labor—that profitable competition which gives life to trade; not that ruinous competition which the stimulus of a forced and unnatural system produces; but the natural competition which grows out of the development of a country and the necessity for a daily supply of its daily wants. This wage-worker demands that we shall frame such a system, if it be within our power to do so, as will furnish twelve months' labor for twelve months' pay. As it is now, whatever other advantage may be claimed for the present system, no fair man will deny that in all the great "protected" industries there can be but seven months of labor, or at least seven months' pay for twelve months' labor, for in seven months when these factories run at their capacity they turn out twelve months' supply for the market they have, so that they give to their operatives the option of seven months' labor, at fair prices for that labor, to secure twelve months' living, or let them work the whole twelve months, but only at such rates as would in the aggregate amount to seven months' pay.

A protective tariff does not, and in the nature of the case can not, fix the wages of labor. Labor, like all commodities, will, under the operation of the law of supply and demand, command its worth in the market where it is for sale; and all that legislation can possibly accomplish is to interfere with the natural operation of this law, and so far as it does this only harm can ensue.

Canada, the United States, and Mexico have protective tariffs, but the price of labor is not uniform in any section of the continent; it differs in every Province of Canada, in almost every State of the United States, and of Mexico.

If there is demand for labor equal to or greater than the supply, then labor is profitably paid; and if combinations of capital to force labor to sell itself at prices fixed by the combination can not be successfully formed, then labor will be free to make its own bargains. But if the market be so restricted that the supply of labor exceeds the demand, or if capital is enabled to combine to prevent competition, then labor must be sold at the price fixed by the employer.

Now, our present system does both—it restricts the market to be supplied by our labor, and it enables the manufacturers to fix the price they will pay to labor. Whenever the duty is high enough to prevent foreign competition, then the operative making and the consumer purchasing those "protected" fabrics are in the power of the manufacturer. No organization of labor, no Knights of Labor, can break such shackles; the "strikes" give only assistance to the "trust," who own the market. The only relief is in Congress by the reduction of duty to the competitive point. We are in morals the partner of every combination rendered possible by the tariff. Who ever desires to dissolve this partnership will support this bill; and *per contra*, those who wish the "trusts" to continue will oppose any amendment or revision of the present law which could endanger their perpetuation. It is a contest between the revenue reform and the tariff trust party.

It is estimated that there are twenty millions of our citizens engaged in gainful operations. Of these it is a large estimate to say that fifteen hundred thousand can possibly be affected by the reduction of tariff duties; the most careful computation is that 7 per cent. may be thus effected. When you exclude all professional men, who, in one form or another, work for their livelihood; all agricultural laborers; all men who do work which must be done at the place where it is required—which is, by very large odds, the greatest part of other labor required in America than agricultural labor, such as house-building, repairing of all sorts, clothes-making, and the daily labor necessary in every community for its daily wants, which can only be done by persons resident in the community and being part of that community—and the operatives in those industries which are not protected or which do not need protection, the number remaining is not equal, in my judgment, to the number required to produce the exports which we now sell abroad.

If a proper estimate be made of the number of men whose labor is required to produce the cotton, wheat, breadstuffs, and manufactured goods which we export, I have no doubt that it would equal the labor employed in the production of the merchandise claiming protection. I do not know whether any one has attempted to make this calculation. If it be true, as I believe it is, then any system which renders unprofitable this labor can not be defended upon the ground that it renders profitable the labor employed in our protected industries, unless the proportion between them is so great that the country can afford to do without these exports or to export them at a disadvantage. But it is indubitably true that these exports are necessary to our prosperity and credit. We could not stand the drain of gold which would be necessary if our exports were seriously diminished. We hold our position

amid the nations of the world now because—I will not say solely, but mainly—of these exports, which furnish to them the food and clothing required by them.

The relief, therefore, of the manufacturer from the payment of this \$40,000,000 a year is so much really given to the production of the crude material in America and to the laborer who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, for it must be remembered that all of this material is absolutely necessary for the successful manufacture of the crude material produced in America. Without it many of our factories would have to be still, and much of the material for which our farmer and mine-owner receive fair prices would become comparatively valueless. From climatic and other reasons there are materials which we absolutely need, but which we can not raise, materials which we must have, and which America either does not produce or produces at such cost as to render the fabric into which it has to be put too expensive for common use. These large importations as a rule—to which, of course, there are some exceptions—add not only to the prosperity of the manufacturer, but are necessary to furnish a market for the product of the material man, and to furnish labor for the wage-earner.

The bill now reported is incomplete in that it does not remove all these burdens. The whole extent to which it does relieve by putting upon the free-list the articles which are on the dutiable list is \$22,000,000. It does, however, reduce the burdens as to the other seventeen millions so far as the committee felt that it could do so at present; for some of these articles which are imported and are put under the classification I have indicated come in competition with articles manufactured in America. And the committee has left duties, in some cases altered, and in some unaltered, as in its best judgment the interests of each individual case required, giving the doubt always to the industry which claimed that it could not survive unless duty was left.

The principal items put upon the free-list have been wool and tinned plate, and the real issue between us and our opponents can not be better illustrated than by the different propositions concerning duty on tinned plate. Not one pound of this is made in America; not one pound of it can be used except in helping some other industry; it enters into many of the most important of our native industries. Our fruits, our fish, our vegetables, our meats, our milk, are canned in these tinned plates; it enters into the domestic economy of every housewife. There is hardly any material of which the distribution is so wide and the use so various, and the burden imposed by the tax levied on it so heavy. It will relieve in more ways and to a larger extent more of the minor industries of the country than almost any repeal of tax upon our whole schedule. Its repeal does not injure a single human being; it affects no interest injuriously. No manufacturer has accepted the offer of the Government, indirectly made by putting a duty on tinned plate, to erect a factory where it is made. Its repeal will cause at once great increase in the industries in which it is used. To make tinned plate free and cheapen sugar will at once give to every farmer who has milk now to waste a market in our large cities for condensed milk. Every owner of an orchard where any sort of fruit now goes to rot because its transportation is impossible will find a market for his product. On the other hand, our opponents offer to make the duty on this article absolutely prohibitory. It is an article which must be used, without which we can not get along. To make the duty 2.1 cents per pound necessarily requires either that it shall be imported at this increased cost, which will be some seven millions a year of added burden to the users of it, or that an inferior article at a much higher price shall be temporarily used by being purchased from the American manufacturer, and into his pocket will go not only the duty which is now paid, which is \$5,706,433.89, but as much more, being the difference between the present duty, 1 cent, and the proposed duty, 2.1 cents, minus just the margin necessary to undersell the foreign manufacturer and prevent its importation.

So that our opponents, under pretense of reducing the revenue, deliberately propose to take from the American consumer of this necessary article a sum not smaller than \$11,000,000, and pay this as a bonus to American manufacturers who already have a protection so large as to be able to make an association which does not hesitate to enter into the politics of the country and send its agents into Congressional districts to aid in the defeat of the Representatives of the people who stand in the way of their personal aggrandizement. On the one hand we propose to promote American industry in all its departments by putting this five million and odd dollars now paid into the Treasury of the United States as an additional sum that may be paid by those who turn tinned plate from its imported condition into the various forms in which it can be used in America to those who, in one way or another, furnish the material which is to be canned, or the labor used in these various industries. On the other hand, our opponents propose to pay as a bonus \$11,000,000 taken from American tax-payers without consideration or compensation under the pretense of aiding American labor. It is not strange that with the hope of accomplishing such a result, associations can be organized, funds for corrupt election purposes raised, and lobbies paid to influence Congress.

As another illustration of this difference, I may give the different propositions concerning the duty on wool and woolen goods. In the report of the majority is a table showing the relation of the proposed duties

under this bill to those proposed by the meeting held in this city last January of the so-called "Wool Growers' Association," and the "Woolen Manufacturers' Association," at which it was agreed that the schedule set out in that table should be submitted to Congress, and if possible, adopted by this Congress as a proper schedule of taxation upon the woolen goods which the American people must use.

To that meeting the tax-payers and the consumers were not invited. Their presence would have been held to have been an impertinence; and from the standard of the gentlemen participating in that meeting this would have been just. They knew that the present tariff law had been, in the main, the result of the dictation of just such meetings held in this and other cities during the last twenty-seven years. The tariff legislation had been practically in the nature of private and special legislation for the purpose of giving to those who succeeded in having "hearings" before the committee that rate of duty which their greed—not their necessities—required. They had grown habituated to the custom of dictating legislation, and the very force of habit, if nothing else, would have prevented them from inviting so inconsequential guests as the tax-payers and the consumers. Some one at that meeting boasted that the Wool-Growers' Association carried a million of voters in its pocket. Such votes as that gentleman could carry in his pocket might find entire comfort in the space which would be allotted to him, in company with a million others, in such pocket.

Their ideal of a Ways and Means Committee was one composed of gentlemen who represented such associations, which belief seems to be shared by Representatives on this floor, whose indignation at the spectacle of a committee framed to represent the tax-payers and the consumers struggles with the proprieties of life to find utterance. Yet the same fierce charge was made in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses.

This Kentucky Speaker seems to be possessed with the absurd idea that the people who pay taxes and purchase goods, who raise wheat and cotton, who live on farms and till the soil, really ought to have some voice in legislation concerning the weight of the burden of taxation which they are to bear, and some representation on the committee whose duty it is to report bills for raising revenue. The idea may be absurd, but, gentlemen, it is growing in popularity, and we are ready to join issue with you in your clamorous plea that the tariff must not be revised except by the friends of the industries protected by it, and to assert that it must be revised by the representatives of all the people who are taxed by it.

I do not hesitate to declare that the schedule agreed upon at that meeting is simply iniquitous. It will be borne in mind that we raise in America about 265,000,000 pounds of wool; that it requires more than 600,000,000 pounds for the uses to which wool is put in our country under our climate. By reason of climatic influences, over which Congress has no control, the hair necessary to be used in certain manufactures can be grown only outside of our territory; and also certain wools not produced in America are absolutely needed to be mixed with our wools to produce the fabrics required. Therefore to utilize the 265,000,000 pounds of American wool and to produce the amount of woolen goods absolutely necessary, there must be imported, either in its raw state or in its manufactured state, over 300,000,000 pounds of wool.

The wage cost of producing woolen goods is estimated to be about \$17.70 per \$100 worth. This is ample protection for the difference between the cost of labor in America and abroad upon any theory whatever, because it gives to the manufacturer the entire cost of the labor he uses. But every pound of wool imported in a manufactured state is so much labor taken from our wage-earners. Every yard of imported cloth represents labor done abroad and the subtraction of that much labor that could by possibility be done here. So that any system which results in the introduction of finished product rather than of crude material is a direct blow at the labor of this country. But this is not the only injury done to labor by this system. The laborers must wear the clothes made out of the wool; our climate necessitates it. The duty on the material increases the cost of his clothing, so that he is by the same act deprived of labor and also compelled to pay an increased cost for his clothing. In addition, as the duty on the raw material is inflexible and must be paid by the manufacturer, whenever there is a depression in prices the only place where the manufacturer can make diminished expenditure is by decreasing the wages of his laborers, so that this laborer who has been deprived in large part of what is his legitimate work and has had added to his expenses the increased cost of his living, becomes now also the victim of the periodic depressions caused by this tax.

The farmer obtains no better advantage under this tax than the laborer. Except in a very few instances, the husbandry of sheep is a subsidiary interest to the farmer's business. Our opponents talk of the "million of flock-masters," as if "the flocks" these "masters" own were their principal capital. They talk also, in adding up the startling sums of money invested in this business, of the value of the farms on which these flocks are kept. There never was a more transparent piece of humbuggery. There are less than fifty millions of sheep in America. Making due allowance for the large flocks in the Territories and some of the Western and Southwestern States, and the large

flocks owned by a few Eastern flock-masters, the average flock of the ordinary "flock-master" can not be greater than twenty to twenty-five sheep, whose cost is almost nothing, for they are the scavengers of the farm. And as mutton, they would pay for the slight expense to which their owners are put in taking care of and breeding them.

I have no doubt that I speak the experience of the great majority of farmers when I aver that a small flock of sheep is of itself an advantage to a farm, and that for the amount invested, the profit on a small flock of sheep is the very largest return of the farmer's operations. The vast majority of those who own sheep do not raise enough wool to clothe their families. The difference between the cost of their clothing by virtue of our tariff, and what it would be if wool were free, would in the great majority of cases cover more than the entire value of their clip—certainly more than any possible difference between the value of wools as "protected" if all our adversaries claim for protection were true, and the price of wool as free; so that the wool-raiser is more interested in the revision of the tariff and the reduction of the duties upon woolen goods upon the basis of free wool than he is in the perpetuation of the present tax. But as there are only a million of flock-masters, the fifty-five million of people scattered all through America who are not pecuniarily interested in the ownership of these flocks are compelled to pay an increased cost for all the woolen goods which they are obliged to use.

But the duty on wool has, by the experience of the last twenty-seven years, been demonstrated not to be of advantage to the wool-grower, because it has not given to him a constant, profitable, and permanent market. Of all the manufacturers we have had in America the woolen manufacturer has had apparently the largest protection and the hardest struggle for existence. He has had to produce his goods at so large a cost of production that he has been constantly on the verge of being unable to dispose of these goods at a price which rendered their manufacture remunerative. He has had to compete with foreign manufacturers who had an absolutely untaxed material, in the use of which, by the very necessity of the case, selection of different sorts of wool was necessary.

No duty could be made so high as to pay the American farmer for raising the sheep whose wools are necessary to be mixed with our wools, and no law could relieve the manufacturer from the necessity of using those wools. It has been a hopeless fight against the elements. Some men have made large fortunes under it by making the cheaper fabrics which, under the prohibitory operation of specific duties, has given to them the absolute control of the American market, which cheaper fabrics are made, not out of wool, but out of wool and adulterants in all proportions from one-tenth wool up, as the conscience or the greed of the manufacturer dictated.

Now, after these twenty years of experience, this meeting held in Washington deliberately undertook to force upon the American people a schedule which increases the almost intolerable burdens now put upon woolen goods, in utter disregard to the claims of justice or the laws of supply and demand. The committee propose duties which are too high, duties which are unnecessary to give to the woolen manufacturer the control of the American market, and these duties range from 30 to 50 per cent.

We have placed these duties thus, because we felt it was to the interest of every section of the country that the woolen industry should be prosperous; that the wool-grower should have a prosperous purchaser of his wool; and the woolen wage-worker finds steady employment in factories running at full time the whole year. And we have placed the duties high enough, in our judgment, to absolutely secure this in spite of any undervaluation or fraud that dishonest importers may be guilty of. And yet our opponents propose to put on these same goods duties running from 69 to 134 per cent. We have arranged the schedule so that the cheaper article may be imported, if it be necessary so to do to prevent any combination or trust, and so as to give to the purchaser thereof an opportunity to buy goods made out of wool instead of so-called woolen goods made out of wool and adulterants. They have devised a scheme by which all the cheaper goods are absolutely prohibited from importation. The finest goods which the rich need have had placed upon them the lowest duties, while the goods which the humble, and even the prosperous who are not wealthy, must use, must be purchased from the American manufacturer. If the American people could be induced to take this table and thoroughly understand the present schedule, the schedule proposed by the committee, and the schedule proposed by the meeting held in January, I believe it would end the controversy between us.

The clamor against free wool which has frightened some is absolutely without justification. The proportion that the wool interest bears to the agricultural interests of America is so small, and the difference—even if all that our opponents say could be true—between its value now and its value under free wool is so inappreciable when compared to the aggregate of the vast wealth of America, and of all the investments which the farmer holds, that the clamor for its protection demonstrates what skillful organization, backed with the aggressiveness of private gain, and urged with conscienceless audacity can do. If this bill goes into operation, one of its beneficent results and not the least will be the emancipation of American politics from the domination of the so-called wool-growers and the freedom of the representa-

tives of the people from the control of those who profess to speak in the name of the million of flock-masters.

The mortgages on the farms and city property of the West represent only a small part of the aggregate price the farmer has paid under a system he has been induced to support by the bribe of taxed wool.

No one, in the true sense of the word, owns the soil he tills, unless the profits of his toil belong to him; otherwise he is merely a tenant, no matter under what name he may work. Under our system the farmer is forced to see his profits, willy-nilly, go to those by whom and for whose benefit this tariff was enacted. By a law which no Congress can control the price of the surplus of any merchandise fixes the price of the entire supply. The price of wheat, cotton, and of other crops and produce, of which we export a surplus, is fixed under free trade at Liverpool. The profits of this produce are more than swallowed up by the cost of what has to be purchased, which is fixed at home under this tariff; so that the farmer's profit has annually gone under the operation of this tariff to those for whom in reality he has been toiling. If it were the profit only it might be endurable, but it has been far more than the profit. The enormous debt owed by the West and South to the East represents two distinct sums—investments out of which the debtor hopes for profitable return and the deficit between the income and the expenditures of the debtors. What this latter amount is it may be impossible to accurately estimate, but in the aggregate it is very large, and is due to the operation of our class legislation.

And as the causes which created the first deficit still exist, and in addition thereto must the annual interest be met, this deficit must continue to increase until disaster occur or those causes be removed. That which produced the necessity for borrowing even when agricultural products were high, will increase this burden of debt, and the depression of our agricultural interests will continue. Our country is so new and rich and there are so many sources of wealth that the slowly accumulating debt is carried without such bending under the load as to make the debtors cry out. But the private debt of the farmers of America is very large, and must of necessity increase unless relief comes by enabling them to sell their products where they can sell at the highest and buy their supplies where they can purchase at the lowest price.

Can he not afford to try the experiment and see if it be not possible to have a financial system which will enable him to keep his own surplus?

The failure of legislative attempts to make employments permanent is signally illustrated in the flax and hemp industry of America. Flax and hemp and the grasses out of which fabrics can be made can be grown in every part of America. The seed of the flax and hemp is valuable for oil, of which great quantities are needed. Since 1842 the duties on both flax and hemp have been more than sufficient to make the production thereof profitable if there were no other causes at work. The duty on hemp was originally imposed in 1789 for the benefit of Georgia, in which State not a pound, practically speaking, has been raised for many years. Under natural causes wholly independent of the tariff the production of hemp increased in America until it reached 79,000 tons.

The peculiar form of labor in Missouri and Kentucky, with the fertility of their soil, rendered it so profitable to raise hemp that they gradually drove from the market all other American hemp. While the tariff still remained the production of hemp in America decreased until it fell below 5,000 tons, while the products made out of hemp and kindred fibers enormously increased. During the last few years, with the duty at precisely the same amount, the farm value of hemp has fluctuated from over \$10 a cwt. to less than \$4 a cwt., and the amount of its production has varied from less than 5,000 to probably as much as 10,000 tons. The duty did not raise the price to \$10 a cwt.; it did not lower the price to less than \$4 a cwt.

Substantially, this has been the history of flax as well as hemp, until to-day the flax grown in America is grown for the seed, and no attempt made to use the fiber. In the mean time substitutes have been found for all the coarser products made from flax and hemp. Our cotton has been covered by bagging made from jute butts; standing cordage has been made from wire. As wheat and cotton had to compete in the Liverpool market with wheat and cotton raised in India, the cost of their production had to be reduced to the lowest possible sum; and so inventive genius has been at work to cheapen the expense of these necessary articles. In the process of these inventions the wheat is harvested with reapers which tie the bundles with twine. Over 33,000 tons of this twine was used in America last year out of, in the main, imported crude material. The use of the finished fabrics made from flax has continued in America even though, for climatic reasons, most of it must be made abroad. Now, during all these years, in the vain attempt to "protect" the flax industry, large taxes have been imposed on the raw material and on the manufactured product. It has been a hopeless contest, except in one aspect. Those who were interested in keeping up this system and who were making from it large sums of money could easily afford to pay to Kentucky nominally \$25 a ton on from 5,000 to 10,000 tons of hemp to silence her protest against the continuance of taxation which required her to pay not only this bribe, which she appeared to receive, but in addition thereto enormous sums.

It was a bargain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can well afford to plead with the Kentucky people to keep up, that they should apparently receive from \$150,000 to \$300,000 a year nominal protection for their hemp, which sum they actually paid themselves, and in addition thereto paid to others very much larger sums, while his constituents and those interested with them really obtained through the operation of this system those profits which built up their cities and States. And the references made on this floor by him and other gentlemen to Kentucky and the whisky trust are simply to weaken the influence of the Representatives from Kentucky, who will no longer consent to be parties to any such "combine." Last year nearly 160,000 tons of these fibers were imported, upon which was a tax of \$1,930,340, and on the products manufactured therefrom an additional tax of \$7,567,641.72.

I submit to the good people of that State that it is my duty to accept the proposition contained in the bill reported, by which the nominal protection to hemp, amounting to perhaps \$200,000, is surrendered, and the American people relieved thereby from a tax of \$4,766,846.88; that it would be utterly unbecoming in me to ask the American Congress to pay to the people residing in the blue-grass section of Kentucky less than a quarter of a million of dollars if thereby they had to tax themselves this \$4,766,846.88. This is the debit and credit side of this much of this bill, but the result thereof is of far more importance really than the amount of taxation removed by this bill.

I trust that the passage of this bill will break up the "trust" made by the Binder Twine Association, by which the price on binding-twine is kept at several cents per pound more than a fair profit thereon.

Wheat and cotton are relieved of a burden which was constantly growing. All articles which have to be put in bags, all furniture which has to be wrapped in burlap, and the numerous other products into which these materials are woven, will be so much cheapened by this bill and the cost of their manufacture diminished that all the goods which can be made out of them in our climate ought to be made in America, and the result of that will be that the uses to which American flax and American hemp can be put will increase the demand for such products. It will be no longer in the power of combinations and trusts to control prices, and the producer of the raw material in America will find that he will have a free market and a fair demand for his crop.

There can be no better demonstration of the wisdom of permitting raw material to be imported free of duty than the experiment tried with raw silk and raw hides. To-day our silk industry is in a most prosperous condition, gradually but surely driving foreign silk from our market, and it will, I confidently predict, successfully compete in other markets with such silks as our climate will permit to be made in this country. It is still more strikingly illustrated in all those industries which are based upon raw hides. The producer of the raw material in America has not been injured; but, on the contrary, benefited by the permission given to our manufacturers to import the material needed by them free of duty, and our tanners, glove-makers, manufacturers of all kinds of leather and of boots and shoes have continued to prosper.

The importation of hides has greatly increased, and the prosperity of those who use them has proportionately increased. There is no reason to doubt that precisely the same result would follow the permission to obtain wool on the same terms that raw silk and raw hides are obtained. The indirect influence has been equally as marked. Our only trade with certain countries grows out of our purchase of raw hides and coffee. Remove the barriers and this trade will widen until we will control the entire trade of those countries whose principal products are raw material, which we can turn into the finished product which they must have.

The questions which necessarily arise out of the discussion occasioned by the introduction of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means have been inherited from our fathers and will be of equal interest to our sons. The very existence of government necessitates the sovereign power of taxation. It is impossible to conceive of a government, in any true sense of that term; of society organized into any form in which it is capable of protecting life, liberty, and property, without the power of requiring the payment of the sums needed for the daily administration of its affairs.

It is the sovereign power, for by it the Government assumes the right and exercises the power to take from the citizen such part of his earnings as is necessary for its support, prior to permitting him to use them for the support of those dependent upon his labor. By means of it, it substracts from the support of the families of its citizens its own expenditures. It ought therefore to absolutely need the money before it resorts to this power, and the limitation upon its exactions should be its necessities. And in a free government where there are, in the eyes of the law, no classes; where every one is the equal of every other one under our institutions and in the protection afforded by the law, not only ought the taxation to be strictly limited by the necessities of the Government, but it ought to be impartially and equally collected from the citizenry. As far as it is possible to accomplish this end, every man should be required, as every man ought to be willing, to pay his fair proportion of the expenses of the Government which has been formed for the purpose of his protection, to which he owes his allegi-

ance, and by means of which he is secured in the enjoyment of the property that he has earned or inherited; and he ought not to be required to pay any more than that fair share.

We therefore, in the very nature of our institutions, find these two fundamental principles; the amount of taxation is to be limited by the necessities of the Government; the distribution of the burdens is to be impartial and equal. When I say the necessities of the Government I mean that the objects for which taxation is levied must be governmental and public purposes; that it is a fraud, under the guise of providing for public expenditures, to lay taxes for private objects. It may be difficult to draw the line of division between public and governmental purposes and private purposes, precisely as it is difficult to draw the exact line which the twilight obscures between day and night. But he who professes to have any doubt about the existence of this line of demarcation is as absolutely foolish or false as he who would deny that there is a broad and visible distinction between the light of noonday and the darkness of midnight.

So, too, it may be quite impossible to so lay and collect the taxes as that the exact proportion that in absolute justice should be assessed against each individual citizen can be ascertained, but it is not difficult to frame the law with the desire and to draw its provisions with the honest purpose to secure that approximate equality which is possible.

Therefore, in the very nature of our Government, the power of the United States to levy and collect taxes is limited by the necessities of the Government economically administered, and its power to apportion those taxes is limited to an impartial distribution among the citizens of the United States. Any system of taxation which violates these two principles is necessarily vicious. But even in a broader view it is vicious under any form of government. The very foundation of all social order is both private and public honesty. Under no form of government nor under any possible pretense can the mere power by which one man's money is given to another man, without his consent and without compensation, be justified. Whenever by operation of law the money earned by one man can be taken by another without just compensation, then the power by which it is done, no matter under what pretense it is exercised, is in the ultimate analysis immoral, and the result is legalized robbery. No argument can change this essential truth; no possible appeal to the growth of the country, to the accumulation of wealth, to the apparent prosperity of the years in which such a system may have been in vogue can justify such a system.

I know that the old and divine test that "by their fruits ye may know them" has been applied by those who profess to be great thinkers as demonstration of the virtue of systems which have in them some inherent vice; so, too, coincidence and proximity are taken for cause and effect—the *post hoc* for the *propter hoc*; and we are in the midst of argumentation of precisely the same sort to-day about the fiscal system of the past twenty-seven years. In my boyhood and early manhood I heard this argument applied when it seemed to be unanswerable. Through negro slavery, it was claimed, a great and fertile country had been redeemed from the forest, had been cultivated to the highest degree of fertility; noble cities had been built; magnificent rivers covered with a profitable commerce; a civilization as delightful as it was splendid had within the memory of living men been developed under a sky of surpassing beauty amid a people adorned with every noble characteristic; and at the beginning of the year 1860 the prosperous, rich, and powerful Southern States, with a future of illimitable hope and glory—the demonstration that African slavery was indeed a beneficent and fruitful institution—seemed by this rule to set the matter beyond dispute. But who now, recalling those sad years of war, and sadder years of reconstruction, and the difficulties which now encompass our people as they are trying to solve the problem of the duplex races, would attempt by that rule to prove the proposition which our fathers so firmly believed?

It has been recognized by the world that the union of church and state has not by the same rule been demonstrated to be most wise. Its advocates point to the gradual illumination of the world, as it emerged from the Dark Ages, led by the church, whose bishops were soldiers and whose soldiers were priests, as the result of that union which gave to the church the power of the sword, and made the sword instinct with the spirit of the church, so that by the power of heroic might the nations were conquered, and by the sweet influence of priestly care they were converted. Yet who in America, recalling all the other facts connected with this long union of church and state, the scaffold and the fagot, the dungeon and the rack, would dare to advocate that we should return to the day when the ruler of the people knelt before the head of the church, and when the decrees of councils contemptuously set aside the enactments of parliaments. The free churches of America, the free churches everywhere, have found that the only true servitude is to God, the only lasting power from God; that, ruling by love through the faith which makes men free, they are indeed powerful. The lesson can not be too often taught, that a vicious principle is in the very nature of the case obliged to work in the end disaster. Whatever may be the appearance during the time when this principle is at work, of prosperity or power, or growth, or wealth, is either only appearance, or it is in spite of and not because of the principle. [Applause.]

No system of taxation could be so oppressive and so vicious as to

have prevented the development and growth of the United States. A country like ours—in its resources so abundant, in its soil so fertile, in its minerals so exhaustless, in its water-power so powerful, lying midway between the two oceans, so as to face Europe on the one shore and the Orient on the other; inhabited by a people the very most enterprising, energetic, and aggressive that the world has ever seen; possessing in the highest degree the faculty of order and the capacity to build States—could not but prosper in spite of any system of taxation which the wit of man perverted to the aggrandizement of personal ends might devise.

When the mere erection of a cabin and the building of a fence and the plowing of the surface of the virgin soil change the value of land from a dollar and a quarter an acre to ten and fifteen dollars an acre; when the deficit of breadstuffs, which would have brought the world to the verge of starvation, could be supplied only by the surplus which these virgin farms, with scarcely any culture joyously rendered; when the clothing which the world needed had in large part to be weaved from the cotton which grew hoar on these fields; when the immigrants from narrow and tax-ridden homes abroad found new and ample homes and constant and profitable labor in these new and outstretching prairies, there was no possibility that any system of taxation could be so oppressive and mischievous as to prevent the marvelous growth and development of such a country. It could only retard that growth and create conditions which would bring unhappiness and distress. It could not prevent the accumulation of wealth; it could only distribute it unequally and oppressively. It could not make the country weak; it could only make the citizens divisible into unequal classes. It could do great harm, but it could not produce destruction.

All the good which these various and fruitful causes have produced has been claimed by the advocates of this system as the necessary and natural result of it. By it God gave to the sun the heat which produced the harvests; through its occult influences the rivers ran downward to the sea; by the resistless might of its silent energies the crops grew and were harvested, and the new homes of the West built, and the railroads laid down. Without it nothing can be accomplished. Its advocates, however, do not ascribe to it the evils which have grown up during the years of its domination. All prosperity comes from it. All adversity comes from other sources.

I am not one of those who in my zeal for revenue reform undertake to prove that the country has not grown richer during this past quarter of a century. Nor am I one of those who ascribe to the protective tariff all those troublesome problems which press upon us for solution. We have daily increased in wealth. There have been sufficient causes for this increase. We have had and now have evils which need remedy. There are other causes than the protective tariff which have helped to produce these evils. We deceive ourselves and we weaken our cause when we are not frank and just about these matters. But there are evils which a protective tariff either produces or, uniting with other causes, aids in producing.

Thirty years ago the American flag was seen in every port. In our bottoms outgoing cargoes paid freight to our ship-owners and incoming cargoes added to the profits of the trip. Our insurance companies during those years obtained the premiums on those cargoes. Our warehousemen received the commissions for their storage. Our merchants made the profits on the exchange of these goods. We sold in the foreign markets in which we were able to buy. We sold at a reasonable profit, we bought at a fair price. The material which we obtained in exchange for our manufactured product we turned into new product, and our laborers obtained the profit of the wages thereby occasioned. And so, year by year, as this commerce grew our wealth accumulated.

All this has been changed; partly it has been caused by the substitution of the iron vessel for the wooden vessel; but largely caused by a system of taxation which rendered it impossible for an American to carry on trade with a foreigner. You can not sell to advantage where you can not buy at a profit. While barter in the old mode, where one man traded his grain for another man's cloth, has apparently passed away, all the commerce of the world is equally barter now as it was then. No man can buy unless some man will buy from him that which he has to sell. No man can sell unless he can buy from the person to whom he sells, directly or indirectly. Besides that, there is a profit which is enormous from the mere handling, if I may so express it, of trade. As civilization increases, in the mere bringing to the consumer that which the producer has made and returning to the purchaser that which the consumer has paid there is a large profit. He who transports these goods, he who insures them, he who guarantees the credit involved in the transaction, he who manages the business of the exchange, becomes as necessary as the weaver or the manufacturer, and must have his share of the cost of production and profit of the transaction.

The little country of Holland has never raised enough in any one year to preserve it from starvation during that year. It has never manufactured enough cloth to prevent its people from great suffering. Rescued from the sea by dykes, it has seized from the sea its enormous accumulation by the mere profit of the exchange of commodities between the producer and the consumer. With the possible exception of two States of the American Union, and a tribe or two of American Indians, the people of Holland per capita are the wealthiest in the world—literally the accumulations given by the ocean to the people who have gathered the profits from exchanging the commodities of the world.

We ought to own the ocean; with our mineral resources and our forests and our extraordinarily long seacoast, with our interior lakes and our mighty rivers, we ought to have been the ship-building, ship-owning, and ship-carrying nation of the world. Into our hands ought the commerce of the world to have naturally drifted; into our coffers ought to have been gathered the profits of these exchanges. It was ours thirty-five years ago; not all of it, but more than 70 per cent. of it, and the great bulk of it ours potentially. We have lost it. We own no ships except those that are in the coastwise trade, with such exceptions that they scarcely need to be spoken of. Our own exports are transported in foreign bottoms under foreign flags, and all the profits of their carrying in every way, and of the returning cargo of imports for which they are sold, go to foreigners. Millions upon millions which ought to have belonged to us have been literally given by us, thrown into the laps of foreigners by our own action.

In 1855, of the tonnage of our foreign trade 71.95 was American; in 1887, 14.80 per cent. was ours; an aggregate decrease of 57.15—the average annual decrease from 1855 to 1866 and from 1866 being about 1½ per cent.

The annual freight paid on our foreign trade to foreigners has been variously estimated from \$140,000,000 to \$200,000,000. This enormous annual tax, now paid to foreigners, ought to have been ours; and the aggregate sum which we have thrown away in our selfish folly since 1855 is much larger than our public debt.

The advocates of the present tariff system vehemently deny that this gradual and fatal decay has been caused by it. They can not deny that as a remedy this policy has been wholly inefficacious. Since 1866 this decay has gone on under the protective system. We can hope for no relief from it.

The unrestrained power in Congress to enact navigation laws was the result of a "bargain" of the New England States with some of the Southern States by which an equivalent therefor, the continuance of the African slave trade for twenty years, was guaranteed (Hildreth's United States, volume 3, page 520), and the navigation laws under which we have lost the carrying trade of our own foreign commerce were conceived in that spirit and enacted in pursuance of that bargain.

The basal thought on which rest legislation creating slavery, prohibitory tariffs, and compulsory navigation regulations, is precisely the same; the power of society organized into government to take from one man that which is his and bestow it by operation of law upon another. Slavery took all of a man's labor, returning only a livelihood measured by the humanity and will of the master. High tariff filches so much of his labor as is necessary to pay the difference caused by the tariff in cost of necessary articles. Compulsory navigation laws force him to purchase, not where he chooses, but where he must. All restrict liberty of action and of selection by legislation, and restrain freedom of choice for the private benefit of others. This thought is at war with the development of man and the progress of civilization, and all legislation based on it must fail.

The substitution of steam for wind as the motive power, and of iron for wood as the material, at once made our navigation laws " antiquated," and to preserve our superiority on the seas we ought to have so amended our laws as to permit American ship-building to be done on equal terms with foreign ship-building, and to permit our citizens to purchase wherever they could buy on the best terms. As sea-freightage is fixed by the laws of free trade—for the oceans scorn our tariff laws and despise our navigation regulations—our obstinate adherence to the selfish policy which controlled our legislation could have no other result. We doomed our ship-owners to a ruinous competition with foreign ship-owners by our navigation laws; and to make the fight absolutely hopeless we prohibited them from receiving returning cargoes by our tariff laws.

We have lost not only what I have just pointed out, but in addition to that, we have actually lost that trade which ought to be ours, even if it were carried on for us by foreigners. Not even can the foreigners, who get all the profit of what commerce we have, keep the American commerce from dwindling year by year. American goods can not be sold anywhere in the world, except as to certain articles of which I will hereafter speak, because America will not allow the purchaser of those goods to sell to American consumers that which that purchaser raises, nor will it allow its own citizens to purchase from those consumers that for which and for which alone they could be induced to buy from us.

An American manufacturer is not able to compete in South America with English manufacturers, because when he offers his goods to that consumer in South America the consumer has nothing with which he can pay—leaving out hides and coffee—that the American can afford to purchase to bring into the country; for the first act that the American Government does to this American citizen who tries to extend American commerce is, without judge or jury, to mulct him in a fine of an average of \$46 for every \$100 of goods which he has had the criminality to attempt to purchase to bring into America, to have worked up by American laborers in American factories, for the purpose of selling at a profit to go into the pockets of American citizens.

This is not a fancy sketch or flower of rhetoric. We have Canada on the north of us, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the south of us; China, Japan, and "The Isles of the Sea" opposite to us on the west, and their trade ought to be with us—by divine

right it is ours. The millions which a fair profit thereon gives to other nations could belong to us. These golden currents which would beautify and fructify our fair land have been turned from our shores by the miserable short-sightedness of those whose greed has weakened their vision and whose selfishness has obscured their judgment.

The climate and other influences which, under Divine Providence, determine what shall be the natural products of a country force us to buy certain material which we need, and which we can not raise. To the extent of that necessity, and to it alone, seek we any commercial relations with the world anywhere. We must have certain articles. At great loss and burden, with enormous duties, we purchase those articles and pay for them so far as possible with our manufactures. To this extent and this extent alone have we trade relations with the world, except so far as our cotton, our breadstuffs, and our provisions are concerned. There the reverse is true—the nations must have these products—they would not buy them from us if they could obtain them anywhere else in the world. Our surplus wheat supplies the deficit of the world's harvest. Our cotton supplies the clothing of the world, and if it were not a necessity we could sell neither wheat nor cotton, so that all the trade we have with the world is compulsory.

But for the blessings of an abundant Providence we would have isolated ourselves from all mankind. If we could have raised all we wanted, and if the world could have raised without us all it wanted, we would have succeeded in erecting barriers more impassable than the fabled Chinese wall. Wherever there has been a possibility to estrange a nation from us, so far as commercial relations were involved, we have succeeded in doing it. It is the only civilized country in the world whose policy has been sedulously to make money by eating each other up—whose highest political economy has been that a people can grow fat upon each other; that by taxation wealth can be accumulated; that the more the Government takes from its citizens the richer the citizens are by the subtraction. And of course such a system must necessarily produce evil symptoms; not at once, and not disastrously in the time at which it has been at work, because other causes have operated and other forces have been at work to minimize the evils of this system.

The necessity for our breadstuffs, our provisions, and our cotton has made a trade out of which we have gotten great profit in many ways and have preserved commercial relations from which great good has resulted. On the other hand, the absolute free trade which under the most beneficent provision of the American Constitution has been made obligatory within the territory of the United States, has given to this great country and to its many millions of people a trade and commerce the blessings of which can not be estimated. The really marvelous growth of the country, so far as any financial system has effected it, has been the result of this magnificent experiment of absolute internal free trade, which has given day by day a daily lie to all the theories upon which our foreign system has been advocated. While it has been claimed that Boston can not succeed with her wealth and enterprise and capital against Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, she has succeeded against the pauper African labor of the South; and Chicago, which could not by any possibility have succeeded as the rival of Toronto, has been able to grow into a magnificent city of a million people in rivalry to New York.

When the boundary of the American territory was the eastern bank of the Mississippi River, all our good people had to be protected against the pauper labor that roamed at large in the uncivilized territory west of the river. But as soon as Thomas Jefferson acquired the territory of Louisiana it was found that free trade was a blessing to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, but that it was disastrous for it to go one step further so that the pauper labor of the Mexicans living beyond that boundary could compete with the American laborer; but when the war of 1847 carried our boundary to the Pacific Ocean and gave us the magnificent territory of Texas, it was found that free trade from ocean to ocean and from lake to gulf made every section prosper. And when in the certain progress of American development Canada becomes one with us, absolute free trade between us will again vindicate itself, as it has between the States.

In levying taxes they ought to be so levied until we may be ready for direct taxation, as, first, to be just, as nearly as this can be accomplished; and second, if it were possible, to be imposed upon and payable out of the surplus of the country, and not out of the amount necessary for the support thereof; and third, to be voluntary, so that the tax-payer, who is also citizen, should not be in a constant state of irritation towards the Government to which he owes allegiance and of which he is in part sovereign.

The system we have violates all of these principles. The very essence of protection is that one man shall pay under the pretense of revenue to his government a bonus to another man; that the purchaser shall be compelled to purchase from an American manufacturer at a price higher than he would be able to obtain the articles for if he were absolutely free to buy wherever he chose; that he should therefore pay for that article two distinct sums of money—one, its fair value to him; the other, the added price which by operation of law he is compelled to pay to the manufacturer, and for which he directly gets nothing. Whatever excuse may be given for this, however it may be claimed that the country is indirectly benefited thereby, and that the purchaser of these protected goods contributes in this way as really to the

public prosperity as if he paid these sums into the public Treasury; the fact remains that in all these industries in which protection is of any advantage one citizen receives by operation of law the earnings of another citizen for which he gives nothing.

I say advisedly, where protection is of any advantage, for there are duties imposed under our present system which are absolutely of no advantage to any human being, neither to the manufacturer, the purchaser, nor the consumers. There are others about which we may dispute as to whether they are of advantage or not. There are others which were purely shams put into the statute for the purpose of deception. The duty on wheat and cotton, whose price is fixed in Liverpool under free trade, is purely a sham; it does not in any way affect the price of either of these articles. The duty on certain cotton fabrics, of which we export large quantities to the East, has ceased to be of any advantage either to the Government, which derives no revenues thereby, or to the manufacturer, who finds that he can make and sell them at prices which successfully compete in foreign markets with foreign manufacturers. And in some cases where the duty is just so much added to the price of the article changes wholly beyond the power of American legislation alter this condition. The duty on copper did not bring to the American Treasury scarcely a cent; it simply put into the pocket of the owners of our copper mines the whole duty imposed, and was a burden, to the precise extent of the duty, upon all American manufacturers of copper and copper wares, and was added, together with the interest and profits thereon, to the cost of such articles as American purchasers had to buy in which copper was a component material. Enormous profits therefore went into the pocket of the copper-mine owners. Some of these profits have been beneficently spent by those to whom by the operation of this iniquitous law these large sums were paid. Charities which bear the name of these copper-mine owners were in reality paid in small sums by all the American citizens scattered over every section of the country who are compelled to use copper in the various forms in which it enters into domestic use. And the foreign manufacturers of copper obtained from the American mines their crude article at the same price that the American manufacturer did, minus the duty, and to that extent had the advantage of their American competitors.

But as the production of copper in the world was not equal to its use, a foreign syndicate has been formed which has purchased the entire output of the known copper mines for a period said to be three years in the future, and has by this means put up the price of copper all over the world nearer to the level of its former price to the American user thereof. So that at present, while the copper-mine owner obtains his profit from the foreign syndicate, and the American consumer of copper is not benefited by this syndicate, the American manufacturer is put more nearly upon a level with his foreign competitor.

The duty upon steel rails has been largely a bonus. It is fair to say that steel rails can be profitably made in America for \$26 a ton. They have been able by the operation of our tariff, giving \$17 a ton protection, to do what it may be impolite, but perhaps not inaccurate, to call levy tribute on the railroad builders of from one thousand to twelve hundred dollars a mile for the 13,000 miles of railroad that were constructed in America in the year 1887. So that the profit over and above a fair living profit on their produce for that year, created altogether by law, could not have been less than \$13,000,000.

The Pittsburgh Post in an editorial of May 1, speaking of the late labor difficulties at the Braddock Works, says:

The cost of labor in the production of a ton of steel rails is estimated not to exceed \$5 a ton. It is probably less than \$4.

At other places the labor cost of a ton of steel rails varies from \$3.85 (at Bethlehem, Pa.) to \$7.57. So with the proposed duty of \$11 per ton the entire wage is paid and a possible bonus of from \$3.43 to \$7.15 given to the manufacturer.

It is, however, fictitious to assert that this sum, enormous as it is, was paid out of the pockets of those who builded the railroads; it was raised mainly, if not altogether, by the sale of railroad bonds, the coupons upon which are part of the fixed charges which the railroad companies must earn or go into bankruptcy. This annual interest must be raised by the reduction of the wages of those employed by those companies, or by the increase of freight charged on what they transport. It is no doubt partly done by both. When the railroads pool this interest is raised by increased freight. When the railroads fall out and fierce competition ensues, it is raised by reduction of wages; so that in the end these enormous yearly bonuses paid to the steel-rail makers are burdens upon labor; they are paid by the reduced wages of the railroad employes, and the reduced cost that the farmer and producer must receive for his wares by means of the increased cost of transportation thereupon. Every bushel of Western wheat, every pound of Southern cotton, every barrel of pork transported over these roads, their price also fixed in the Liverpool market, must pay its share of this enormous sum muled from honest labor by a provision of the tariff law passed in the name of American labor at the dictation of the most powerful organization in America.

I select these instances to illustrate that the present system violates intentionally the first principle I have laid down, that all taxation should be impartial, and also that it violates intentionally the second

principle, that this taxation should, as far as possible, be paid from the surplus of the nation instead of from its daily livelihood. As it is now all the direct and indirect sums which must be paid because of the present tariff law are to be first subtracted from the aggregate income of the American nation, and are that much taken from this income before any of it can be used for the support of the American people. It is estimated that on the basis of the labor of 1880 the income of the American people was ten thousand millions of dollars. Before this can be distributed among the partners in this enormous corporation that we call the United States of America these sums must be subtracted, and as the sum is to be distributed among sixty millions of people, the amount subtracted, while in itself it may seem not to be very large in proportion to the enormous aggregate, is large in proportion to the amount received by each laborer in the country. The amount he pays must be measured not by the entire amount of this income, but by the sum which he is to receive therefrom.

A system of taxation which, if it could be devised, would give to each person in America a fair and comfortable living, and impose the burdens of the Government upon the surplus, which, being produced by the united labor of everybody, ought to bear, if it could be done, the expenses necessary to the protection of everybody, would be a wise and beneficent system. Under it there might be less rapid accumulations of great fortunes, but there could be no distress. It would fall so equally that no single person under its operation would be distressed. Now, the operation of the present law during the last twenty-five years has been precisely in the opposite direction, as is demonstrated by the accumulation of the almost fabulous fortunes which we have seen grow up under our eyes during those years.

Unequal distribution of the wondrous wealth which has been produced by American toil and accumulated by American economy has given to certain individuals fortunes greater than the world has ever seen under any other sky or any other system. The law of primogeniture, operating through the centuries, together with the vast growth of wealth in Great Britain, has not been able to give to any human being such a fortune as the protective tariff of America has enabled a few gentlemen to secure within a score of years. Colossal fortunes, made as if in a day, bear testimony to the viciousness of a system which enables so few men to absorb the surplus accumulations of a nation, and that, too, without adding anything to the growth of the country or to its happiness. It has laid the foundation of caste in creating classes and distinctions between the classes created by it.

Inevitably unjust legislation, giving unearned privileges to classes as classes, must produce class combinations and organizations to maintain the legislation once obtained; and this with equal certainty begets hostile combinations, and the result is the formation of caste, which simply means the permanent defeat of the weaker classes. I am not censuring those who have been the beneficiaries of this system, nor am I uniting in the clamor, which sometimes savors of demagoguery, against them personally. I am simply pointing out the outward symptom which demonstrates that there must be an inward disease. I am simply asserting that the possibility of such a result must be caused by the viciousness of this financial system which for twenty-seven years has existed in America.

Generically the same causes produce strikes, riots for bread, labor organizations, and the other manifestations of resistance to oppressive class distinctions in Europe and America. It is the operation of unequal laws creating class benefits. In whatever form this oppressive distinction appears there will also be found resistance to it. As man moves forward in the upward path to a civilization imbued with the controlling spirit of the truth that all men are born free and equal, the depth of his original degradation and the weight of the yoke he wore measure the nature and extent of the revolt. In France the horrors of the revolution measured the long years of oppressive crimes of which that revolution was the retribution. In England the parliamentary struggles mark the point from which those people began the march to equality. If we will persist in class legislation we must submit to accept its necessary concomitant, discontent, exhibited first in protest by murmurings, then in resistance only by organizations, and then by whatever force the circumstances produce. We have as our hope of safety the ballot-box, by which peaceful revolution may prevent forceful revolt. But if enormous capital, through organized effort, can control the ballot-box and return its servants to Congress, discontent, founded on justice, will find a remedy. Free trade in England can not prevent, it will hasten, the ultimate abolition of the law of primogeniture, the disestablishment of an established church, the exclusive ownership of the soil, and of a hereditary legislative chamber. Protective tariffs and monopolistic legislation can not introduce into America permanent and hereditary class distinctions. He is a shallow thinker who does not know that man is essentially the same everywhere, and that his ultimate goal is a civilization based on equality.

And also our system enforces the collection of the taxes so as to give the tax-payer no option as to its payment. He does not pay to the tax-gatherer, as in the States where direct taxation is enforced. Nor does he pay voluntarily in the same sense as a man does who purchases a luxury, knowing that its increased price is caused by a revenue duty

imposed thereon, but he is compelled to pay by the increased cost levied upon the necessities of life. Even if a hundred and twelve per cent. duty be levied upon his blanket, the blizzards which sweep over Kansas require a Kansas father to pay this involuntary tax with a demand more compulsory than the pistol of the highwayman with "Stand and deliver." He who has to build a house for his family on the homestead which he has acquired for nothing from the Government is compelled by a law, which knows no exception, to pay this involuntary tax upon every pane of glass which he puts into the window to let the sunshine in and keep the rain out; upon every foot of lumber and every nail which, together, make his home—not one dollar of which, as a rule, goes to his Government, nor lessens the burdens of his State taxes, but goes to citizens entitled under the law to no greater consideration and no higher favor than he.

It is undoubtedly true that under the operation of the stimulus of high protective duties, competition takes place. Men with small capital, unfamiliar with the particular industries thus protected, rush into them, factories are erected at large expense, and frequently on credit, at improper places, because the calculation on paper of the cost of the production and of the possible price under the protective duty, leaves an apparent profit so large as to overcome the great expense of interest, unfortunate selection of locality, and unfamiliarity with the business. Temporarily this competition produces decrease of the price asked of the consumer, and causes an overproduction of the article. Then comes, inevitably, disaster. The weak go to the wall. Bankruptcy diminishes the number of manufacturers, clamor is made for increased protection for the purpose of paying higher wages, while the wage of the laborer is necessarily diminished.

Then comes combination. The strong who have survived the storm of disaster see that they can take advantage of these duties much more profitably by a union among themselves, and fleeing their customers, rather than fighting each other, and trusts, pools, and organizations are formed by means of which prices are advanced and production diminished. I do not mean to say that a tariff either necessarily produces trusts or that it alone produces them. These organizations can be formed whenever combination of producers can prevent competition, but these trusts can be destroyed whenever they are formed under the operation of protective duties by lowering the duty so as to afford opportunity for foreign competition, whereby the consumer of the necessary article may have a chance to purchase it from some one else than the trust. I need not illustrate this by an attempt to go over the category of trusts, like the sugar trust, the linseed-oil trust, the borax trust, and the various other combinations which are the legitimate outgrowth of the system which Congress is asked to perpetuate, and which has the power by the irresponsible action of those interested in the product of these various articles to levy taxation upon the American people to the extent that our duty enables them to keep out the foreign manufacture.

The bill reported by the committee does not render certain the destruction of these combinations, but as to some of them it renders their exactions tolerable, and as to others we believe it will result in their dissolution. We urge that in the present condition of our financial affairs the country can well afford to make this experiment and say whether it is possible for Congress to prevent the exactions of these organizations. Those interested in these trusts, made possible by the present tariff, and which the proposed bill will dissolve, or will reduce their present exactions to more reasonable profits, naturally denounce those who prepared this measure, and use the gains gotten from the law to preserve unchanged the law. And those Representatives who represent these organizations may be expected to resist the passage of this bill desperately. I hold in my hand *The Manufacturer*, the official organ of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, in which is published a memorial, and the opening sentence of the editorial thereon is:

The club as a body of business men spoke in no unmeaning phrases at its last meeting. For the guidance of those who represent it in Congress, it put in the form of a memorial its sentiments concerning the reduction of revenue, etc.

Who represents "it" in Congress? "It" knows, I do not. But who ever represents the "Its," who have combined to enact this burdensome tariff and to defeat any amendments thereto which will give relief from the enormous exactions imposed by it and by means of it, will be found compacted against any tariff legislation which renders possible the dissolution of the "trusts." Fortunately no laws, however prohibitory, and no trusts, however greedy, can prevent the progress of invention and the achievements of skill, by which the cost of production is always being diminished. Our opponents point to the diminished cost of all articles during the period of the present tariff, and claim that it is because of the tariff.

The facts are as they state; the cause is not. There is not one product named by them, which is not to-day cheaper in England than in America. If the tariff thus operated, its present friends would soon become its bitterest foes. They do not fight so desperately for the continuance of laws whose operation is to destroy their profits. But no law can prevent that development which increases the efficiency of human labor as it increases in skill and multiplies many fold its power

of production, nor can any nation so isolate itself as to be beyond the influence of this universal spirit of improvement. This at last is our safety.

Therefore skilled labor never needs protection. The more unskilled the labor is the less is it in demand and the lower its productive power and the higher its relative cost. So in times of depression the labor to which least money is paid is the first discharged, because the highest priced labor is the cheapest labor, producing more results in proportion to wage and therefore costing less to employer. The leader of the bar needs no tariff to protect him from the shyster, the great doctor does not fear the competition of the quack, nor does the respectable mechanic feel alarm at the competition of the pauper journeyman.

So it is certain, in spite of doctored figures, manipulated to conceal and mislead, that in America the labor receiving the highest wage produces for its employer the largest return, and is therefore the cheapest, and that as a rule the wage-cost of the fabrics in America is less than anywhere in the world. Free American labor from the trammels of our present tariff and it will conquer the world of trade. [Applause.] But even with prohibitory tariffs and numerous trusts the cost of production will continue to decrease and thereby cause some decrease in the cost to the consumer; but not in proper proportion, for under such a system the bulk of the sum thus saved in production will swell the profits of the manufacturer.

The question has been often asked by our opponents, why do immigrants come to America if labor is paid so nearly as much abroad as here. Our first answer is that the questioner always confounds the daily wage received by the wage-earner with the cost of his labor to his employer. The daily wage may be much greater than is paid elsewhere and yet the relative cost be, and probably necessarily is, less; for labor cost is to be measured by volume and value of production to him who pays; by amount of money and the purchasing power of that money to him who receives. But, secondly, in the meaning of the questioner, the assumed fact is not true. The "operatives" do not migrate to America; those who are in Great Britain and Europe, the wage-earners in those industries which are "protected" here, do not come to us. Mr. Powers, one of the brightest of the "press gang," to whom we owe so much, has done good service in an article exhibiting the occupations of our immigration, from which I have gathered this:

In the ten years from 1877 to 1886 there arrived in this country 4,255,295 immigrants, of whom somewhat more than one-half were women and children; of the remaining 2,120,582 there were only 35,581, or less than 2 per cent. operatives in the textiles, metals, and other protected industries, excluding miners, of whom there were 38,570, being less than 2 per cent. These were, as a rule, those with whom life had not gone well at home, and were of numbers just sufficient to be used either as a menace or a substitute to striking operatives. In the unprotected industries we received 2,046,431, of whom 1,523,707 were house servants, tillers of the soil, and common day laborers. These are attracted evidently by other causes than our tariff laws.

But, thirdly, the advantages offered by the new continent and our free institutions tempt men of all climes to cast their lot in with us. The tax-gatherer, the recruiting sergeant drafting into armies where 2,200,000 men are under rigorous discipline, and the hopeless contest against class distinctions drive thousands to our shores. Let us keep them and our own children happy by low taxes, no standing armies, and absolute equality of chances in the struggle of life.

Several times since this debate commenced the true argument against this bill, the only really effective appeal, has been uttered; it may be condensed into "United we stand, divided we fall." It is the argument of combination, of threat. Each "protected" syndicate says to all others in this greatest of all American "trusts," the "tariff combine," "We must stand together, four-squared like infantry in battle resisting a charge, for revision anywhere is defeat everywhere." So the sole duty any one will give up is that on sugar, because they believe the surrender of the sugar duty will take from the Treasury so many millions of dollars that thereby all the other duties may be saved. The promise to give bounties is as purely illusory as were the offers made on the Mount of Temptation. The present tariff is the result of combination; it is to be maintained by combination. The interests which secured its passage are to retain its benefits; the means received by it, so far as necessary, are to be used to perpetuate it. Yes, gentlemen, we recognize the force of this argument.

The removal of the duty on sugar will give no relief to the manufacturers of New England; it will not aid in the restoration of our lost commerce, remove the necessity for the use of Pinkerton's detectives to put down those strikes which have been lately discovered to be the evidences of contented labor and the demonstration of wise and happy industrial progress; secure a profitable market for Western wheat or Southern cotton; furnish competition to keep trusts within bounds; nor end—believe, good gentlemen, who defend this prohibitory tariff and class legislation—the agitation of which you complain. Free tobacco and free sugar will not bring submission to your exactions. Let us understand each other. We want a fair, conservative, moderate measure; we extend to you a compromise and offer a fair experiment. You may reject it, but you can not evade the issue. He who rejects compromises may live to regret it.

The present law can not remain as it is; its inequalities are too numerous and too unjust, its temptations to fraud too great, its burdens too onerous; revision is needed, and that, too, by every section of the country. The arrogance displayed on this floor by certain Representatives does not reflect the anxiety felt by many of their constituents. In New England and Pennsylvania, as in Minnesota and Michigan, are heard the murmurings of discontent. There is no section whose interests demand the passage of this bill more than New England. And today I appeal from such of her Representatives here as stand in the way of progress to her people at home to take hold of this matter. It was against her protest that the protective tariff was enacted—perhaps the most splendid protest against it was by her Webster. Her true interest is the reconquest of the seas. Her hope of regaining leadership in the Republic is to put herself in the van of this movement for free commerce and unshackled industrial activity. It doth not become her to oppose where men fight for ampler freedom.

The boast has been made on this floor that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses—that gallant and pure gentleman, brave of heart, clean of life, loyal to friend, frank to foe, with a conscience void of offense and a love for truth that nothing could daunt—has been stricken down because he opposed this "combine." Greatly as I deplore his defeat and as much as I miss his presence, it may be that his defeat, compassed as it was, will be of greater benefit than his presence. His very absence arrests the attention of the Republic, and all the people ask, "Are such elections necessary to the maintenance of this system?" Gentlemen protectionists, I warn you that the vacant seat of Morrison cries louder than the virtues of Duncan "against the deep damnation of his taking off." [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

The effort in this debate by grave Representatives to demonstrate that taxation on foreign commodities is paid by the producers and not by the consumers; that prices are lowered by increasing the cost of production, and that taxation gives added wealth to the fruits of labor puts to shame the rhetorical and pious demonstration of Rev. Jasper, of Richmond, Va., that "the sun do rise and set," for not even before Galileo did any one ever believe thus, nor has it as much excuse as had the riots against the introduction of machinery which Miss Martineau so graphically describes.

One of the greatest of modern scientists has very recently said:

No fact in political economy is more clear than that taxation on foreign commodities must ultimately be paid by the consumers, not by the producers. All taxation is a deduction from the fruits of labor and from the fertility of the soil of the country imposing it. No political economist has ever been able to show how prices to consumers can be lowered by increasing the cost of production.

This thinker and scientist had not the pleasure and advantage we have enjoyed of hearing this debate, for nothing can be more certain than our friends on the other side are political economists with whom "wisdom shall die," and that they have proven to their own entire satisfaction that those who believe what this thinker announces are miserably shallow and altogether wicked.

These agile and fertile debaters have as little regard for the facts of history as they have for the truths of political economy. To them the established fact that the era from 1850 to 1860 was one of wondrous prosperity and growth, and that 1860 was peculiarly and singularly a prosperous year, does not prevent them from solemnly declaring that under the Walker tariff the country nearly went to the demnition bow-wows and was in 1860 on the very verge of bankruptcy. And no one has put this with greater power than did General Garfield in his speech of March, 1878.

The two countries which in the last quarter of a century have increased with the most marvelous growth have been our own and Australia. Different financial systems have dominated these two new and prosperous countries. One common cause for their prosperity attracts attention; that is, new land to be had almost for the asking. This is the prime cause of the past and present growth of both of these lands—not the only cause; for these countries are dominated by an English-speaking race, and on their fertile soil flourish free institutions. The continued prosperity of each is assured. Loving my own country more than all others in the world, I desire her to adopt a system that will enable her to outstrip this lusty young rival of the Pacific seas. It is within our power.

Seventy per cent. of the cotton which England turns into finished product and sells all over the habitable globe grows upon American soil. She comes to our markets, buys our raw material, transports it in her vessels to her docks, manufactures it with her laborers in her factories, transports it in her vessels to every port, transmutes it by barter under the laws of supply and demand into other articles; makes a profit on the purchase, on the freightage, on the manufacturing, and then on the articles for which she sells it. Her annual increase of receipts over the price that she pays us for our cotton is not less than \$125,000,000. In twenty years her apparently overcrowded population has increased over six millions. The wages of her laborers have steadily increased. The number of her paupers and convicts has proportionately decreased. With equal strides have her political privileges been widened to larger classes of her citizens.

Now, this profit from the manufacture of this cotton should be ours. Our citizens ought to take this raw material raised in our fields, turn

it into the finished product in factories owned by American capital, where American operatives receive the wage that would be a just proportion of the profit of this labor. Our ships ought to transport the outgoing and the incoming cargoes; our insurance companies receive the premiums; our commission merchants the commissions; our bankers the exchange. A system which prevents this is a system to be set aside. A system which gives hope of this is a system to be fairly tried. And as with cotton, so with wool, and all the material which by the ingenuity of man can be used for the comfort of man in his advanced civilization. Such a country as ours with such a system has a future which no imagination is able to accurately picture. If one standing on the banks of the Mississippi River eighty-five years ago, when Thomas Jefferson acquired that great western territory for America and free institutions, could have foreseen what has occurred during these years, not longer than the lifetime of some venerable citizens who linger yet among us, and had given utterance to the heavenly vision which passed before his eyes, he would have been held to be a mere dreamer.

If one, standing here in this Hall to-day and looking into the future, could be able to see what the years would bring us under a system where the untrammelled activities of a free Christian people find fruition, under a climate so salubrious and with a soil so fertile, all burdens to progress thrown aside, all the passions of the past removed, and every one engaged in a generous and unselfish rivalry to make for and out of the opportunities to which he is called all that is possible, no hand could paint and no orator picture what would be the result.

Then we, the children of exiles and emigrants, could welcome our kinsmen of all lands to cast their lot with us, for willing hands would find waiting work to yield a livelihood. The silence of rivers now broken only by the occasional boat would be turned into the sweet hum of profitable commerce. The secret lodges of anxious and discontented operatives would become the open assemblies of happy and contented families from whose hearth-stone the shadow of want had given place to the mild radiance of permanent comfort. The husbandman, no longer sowing in tears, would yet reap in joy—that joy which springs from content, and is founded in the certainty of an assured market at remunerative prices.

The legislation of the country, having for its object the public good and freed from the domination of private greed, would successfully grapple with the problems which progress will present, and a free people be represented by free representatives neither owned, seduced, nor terrified by organized interests.

Slowly will this future come. We have had our backs to it; to-day let us turn our faces to its rising sun. If we can do no more, we can lift our eyes toward this east of new hopes and resolve that from this hour our steps shall be in that direction. [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver;

A bill (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the United States of Colombia;

A bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employes of the custom-house, for extra-time service;

A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of the heirs of A. Gates Lee and heirs of B. P. Lee, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate of Job Barnard;

A bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to timber depredations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, requested a conference with the House on said bills and amendments, and had appointed conferees on the part of the Senate, as indicated:

A bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory. Conferees: Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE; and

A bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory. Conferees: Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, for printing the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress) relating to the fisheries treaty, in connection with a message of the President of the United States on the same subject, the proposed treaty with Great Britain, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor;

A bill (S. 66) giving a military record to Thomas Miller;

A bill (S. 128) for the relief of the inmates of the United States Naval Home;

A bill (S. 204) for the relief of the heirs of Maurice Grivot;

A bill (S. 304) to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry;

A bill (S. 326) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry;

A bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York;

A bill (S. 586) for the relief of Asher W. Foster;

A bill (S. 587) for the relief of Christian Fredericksen;

A bill (S. 686) for the relief of B. F. Rockefeller;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of James E. Walter;

A bill (S. 1031) for the payment of Sewell Coulson and Porter, Harrison & Fishback for legal services;

A bill (S. 1092) for the relief of certain property in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, deceased;

A bill (S. 1612) to provide for the closing of parts of two alleys in square 132, in the city of Washington, D. C., and for the relief of Charles Early and Corbin Warwick;

A bill (S. 1864) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Diego, Cal.;

A bill (S. 2199) authorizing the Little Rock and Alexandria Railway Company to maintain and construct a bridge across Bayou D'Arbonne, in Louisiana;

A bill (S. 2213) for the relief of John McBean, of Umatilla County, Oregon;

A bill (S. 2316) restoring the right of pre-emption to Jesse A. Corn;

A bill (S. 2461) appropriating \$150,000 for quarters and barracks at the branches of the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers;

A bill (S. 2517) for the establishment of a light-ship at Bush's Bluff Shoal, Elizabeth River, Virginia;

A bill (S. 2427) to establish a public park, to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park;

A bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District; and

A bill (S. 2602) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) was called to order by Mr. McMILLIN, who directed the reading of the order providing for the Friday evening sessions.

The Clerk read the order.

JOHN RUTLEDGE.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2651) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That John Rutledge, of the State of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all political disabilities imposed upon him by the third section of the fourteenth article of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

HETTY K. PAINTER.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to call the attention of the House to the bill (H. R. 3839) granting a pension to Mrs. Hetty K. Painter, and to make this statement. This bill passed the House and went to the Senate, and was there amended. It came back to the House, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and by them reported to the House with the recommendation that the amendments of the Senate

be non-concurred in. I desire to move now that the amendments be non-concurred in, and that the request for a conference be granted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will appoint the conference committee hereafter.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole under the special order which has been read.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar of private bills be taken up, and that we commence where we left off on last Friday evening; each case to be called in its order on the Calendar, and when called unless responded to it be informally passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. RYAN. Before that is done may I ask where we left off; on what page of the Calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk at the desk is unable to state where the call was suspended at the last meeting. The RECORD, the Chair supposes, will show it.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LONG. I object to that.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. Then I demand the regular order.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that the regular order may be observed with this exception, that if no member present calls for the consideration of a bill when it is reached on the Calendar it be informally passed over, retaining its place.

Mr. TAULBEE. I am in favor of that, but would like to offer this suggestion as an amendment to it. I think it would meet the objection of the gentleman upon the other side if the call began where it rested last Friday evening, but with the understanding that we first take up for consideration such bills as were then passed over at the request of the members present.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection to that.

Mr. TAULBEE. We will save the calling of their bills in their order on the Calendar and thus save time, as my request will obviate the necessity of going over the whole list.

Mr. CHEADLE. I can state where we left off on last Friday evening. On page 63 of the Calendar, at bill No. 4504.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan as modified?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, House bill 5961, to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I do not understand that there was any objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan, but only to the modification of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Ohio to object.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. As I understood the Chair to put the request of the gentleman from Michigan as modified, I objected. I have no objection to the original request.

Mr. FORD. Then I renew that request.

Mr. RYAN. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that order will be pursued. There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LIZZIE WRIGHT OWEN.

The first business on the Calendar called up by Mr. HERMANN was the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lizzie Wright Owen, only surviving daughter of George Wright, late a brigadier-general of United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

Mr. HERMANN. As the report is somewhat lengthy perhaps gentlemen may not object to my making a brief statement of what it embodies.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the report. This is a peculiar case and we ought to have it read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio), as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen, having considered the same, report it back with the recommendation that it do pass, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 177, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen, have examined the same, and report:

"This bill passed the Senate in the last Congress, and your committee report it back again, recommending its passage, and submit their former report:

"The claimant is the daughter of George Wright, late a brigadier-general of

the United States volunteers. We append hereto the record of his distinguished military service furnished by the War Department, and a notice of his services and death which appeared at the time; also a copy of her petition, which states the grounds of her present claim, and other documents in support thereof.

"She is now poor, and her physician in this city presents a statement of her present condition, that she is suffering with attacks of disease, increasing in severity, which will soon entirely disable her.

"It will be observed that the extraordinary services and misfortunes detailed in this case prevent its forming a precedent to any extent for other applications, and to refuse this application would, in the opinion of your committee, be an exhibition of ingratitude unworthy the Republic.

"We recommend the passage of the bill."

Mr. HERMANN. The remainder of the report consists only of the petition and some communications bearing upon the subject.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the remainder of the report.

Mr. GLASS. That seems to be a very long report, and I think this bill ought to go over to a full House. I shall object to its consideration to-night.

Mr. HERMANN. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he will indulge me for a moment? I am sure no gentleman will deliberately object to a measure of this character when acquainted with the circumstances. I desire to make this statement, and if the gentleman from Kentucky, Governor McCREARY, was present, he would corroborate largely what I desire now to say briefly. Unfortunately, however, he is not here, though he was present at the last time, expecting this case to be considered then.

This is the daughter of Maj. Gen. George Wright, who went down in a shipwreck on the coast of Oregon some twenty years ago on the ill-fated Brother Jonathan. This woman's mother was with him at the time. He was traveling to Portland, Oregon, with a number of soldiers, and in a great storm which overtook the ship she went down and all were lost. Her brother, Colonel Wright, was massacred in the Modoc massacre at the time he was gallantly leading his command into the conflict, about the same time that General Canby was killed. Under those circumstances she lost her brother, who had given her valuable support subsequently to the death of her father.

Her husband, who had rendered gallant service in the war, received wounds which ended his life. She is now without father, mother, brother, or husband, except one brother, who has been recently appointed to a position in the Supreme Court under this Administration, who, I understand, is now contributing to her support. Of the three persons who were her supporters I may say all of them gave their lives in the service of the country.

This woman is to-day penniless, up to a recent period working with her own hands for a livelihood. Never has this Government suffered to the extent of a single cent in the matter of a pension in any one of those cases, neither for the general who went down, nor the brother who died for his country in the Modoc difficulty, nor for her husband. So you will see this is certainly a meritorious case, and it is a case of very peculiar hardship. It is a case, it seems to me, in which the Government could very well afford to extend its gratuity under these peculiar circumstances. Being an exceptional case, I ask that this House shall do as it has done in so many other cases not possessing nearly the merit this case possesses. I hope the House will agree to grant the relief requested. The bill has passed the Senate unanimously, and it comes before the House with a unanimous report from the House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman say that this bill has passed the Senate?

Mr. HERMANN. It has.

Mr. MACDONALD. What other similar case has the House passed?

Mr. HERMANN. The House has passed a number of cases of much less merit. The House granted pensions to widows whose husbands were possibly of greater distinction, but in this case the widow did not receive a pension.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman mention any such case?

Mr. HERMANN. You may take the case of the widow of General Ricketts or the widow of General Logan, and others.

A MEMBER. Those cases are quite different.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Why could this lady not be pensioned on account of her husband?

Mr. HERMANN. Her husband died after the war, when not in the service.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not rise to oppose this bill, but for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the fact that they have reported to the House a bill granting a pension to the invalid daughter of General Hackleman. In my experience in connection with the late war there has been no case of so high merit as that. I understand that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has reported a bill to pension the daughter at \$18 a month; not a widow, but a daughter, as in this case.

I wish to say if this bill passes that I will ask the Committee on Invalid Pensions to put Mrs. Hackleman's pension on the same footing.

Mr. McMILLIN. If this bill is to pass at all, why not put the pension on the footing of a widow's pension? There is no ground on earth on which you can justify giving the daughter of a deceased soldier, who is not entitled to a pension at all under the law, \$50 a month,

while you give the widow of a man whose head was shot off in battle only \$12 a month.

Mr. HERMANN. This lady is not only the daughter of a soldier, but she is the widow of a soldier.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why, then, can she not get a pension under the general law?

Mr. HERMANN. For the reason that her husband died after the war, when not in the service.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then she is not entitled to a pension under the general law; but you propose to give her more than you give to four women whose husbands were actually killed in battle.

Mr. HERMANN. I submit to the gentleman from Tennessee that the circumstances which surround this case are entirely exceptional.

Mr. McMILLIN. There are no more harrowing circumstances, of course, than those surrounding a woman who has to look at a dead husband. But the tendency of this kind of legislation is to build up classes and to grant larger pensions to widows on account of the former official standing of their husbands, ignoring the fact that all American citizens before the law are, or should be, on an equal footing.

Mr. HERMANN. Has the gentleman taken the same position with regard to other cases?

Mr. McMILLIN. I have, exactly. I have uniformly voted against granting these exorbitant pensions to one class while we give a mere pittance to others.

Mr. HERMANN. Does the gentleman think it is right and just that this House should make a discrimination in favor of those who possibly may have more influential friends or whose husbands may have borne more distinguished titles than others?

Mr. McMILLIN. No, sir; but you are going upon the idea that this woman has got fifty-dollar influence.

Mr. HERMANN. I do not claim it on that ground at all.

Mr. McMILLIN. I inferred that you did from the way you spoke.

Mr. HERMANN. Not at all, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have tried in my action here to do equal justice to all, and I state now most candidly that my acumen is not sufficient to enable me to see that because a woman is the daughter or the widow of a deceased general she has any greater claim upon this Government than the daughter or the widow of a poor fellow who did not have any rank in the war, and who went out to fight not for the glory but for his country. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, since I observe that there is such opposition to this bill in its present form, as I do not wish to delay pension legislation here this evening, I will make a proposition which I believe will meet with the cordial indorsement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN]. I will accept an amendment making this pension \$30 instead of \$50. That was suggested in this House some two or three weeks ago, but I declined then to accept the compromise, preferring to submit the case to the House upon its merits. Under the present circumstances, however, I will accept it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why not put this woman on the same footing as we put the daughter of a man who was killed in battle? She is not entitled to any pension at all under the law. What is given is given as a gratuity. I am not objecting to that, because I propose always to resolve my doubts in favor of those who appear to have claims on the Government. I had not intended to open my mouth at all upon this subject, but I desire to say now, as a citizen of the United States and a representative of its people, that in my judgment we will legislate most wisely and most equitably when we make our laws uniform, and when we leave every American citizen to believe that he or she has the same right before the law as every other one has. I do not believe in building up classes in this country founded upon the standing or rank which individuals may have obtained. There is no higher standing in this country than American citizenship, and we have all got that. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. LYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the galleries be cleared. The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOCKERY). If the applause is repeated the Chair will direct that the galleries be cleared.

Mr. MORRILL. I simply desire to say in behalf of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that I have no recollection of this bill having ever passed that committee. I do not want to be understood as saying that it did not pass, because I may not have been present when it was considered, but if I had been present I should have opposed it bitterly.

The principle adopted by the Committee on Invalid Pensions has been to allow pensions to invalid children who have passed the age of sixteen. Where a child is imbecile or crippled and helpless, we have gone to the extent of granting pensions to children over sixteen, but only in such cases. In the case of General Hackleman, who was killed in battle, we allowed her a pension of \$18. We fixed upon that amount because she was a helpless invalid unable to take care of herself. We have established that rate in such cases—that is, in all of them that we have allowed, but we have only allowed pensions to children over sixteen years where they were invalids or helpless and compelled to depend upon charity for support. As I understand this case, the claimant is not an invalid, but is capable of taking care of herself.

Mr. HERMANN. She is an invalid.

Mr. MORRILL. I understood the gentleman to say she earned her

living with her own hands. I move to amend this bill by striking out \$50 and inserting \$18.

Mr. McMILLIN. I suggest that the pension be fixed at the rate provided by law for a widow.

Mr. MORRILL. In the cases of imbecile children—

Mr. McMILLIN. But this is not such a case.

Mr. MORRILL. In those cases we have fixed the rate at \$18 a month.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am in favor of granting pensions wherever they are deserved, but we do not popularize the system of pensions, nor do we satisfy the pensioners themselves when we place one class upon the rolls at a rate twice or three times as high as another class equally meritorious.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman from Oregon that he can get along easily with this bill by agreeing to make the pension the same that is allowed to other widows, and, as I have said, even that is beyond the law, because this is not a soldier's widow. She went from under her father's protection and married another man who did not lose his life in the service.

Mr. HERMANN. He lost his life from disabilities incurred in the service.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then the case comes under the general law, and if so, why does not she get her pension through the Pension Office?

Mr. HERMANN. Simply because she is unable to prove certain facts that the office requires proof of.

Mr. McMILLIN. Oh, yes. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] by striking out "\$18" and inserting "\$12."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken I desire to say a word in vindication of myself. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] has suggested that he has no knowledge of this bill having passed the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL. I said I was not present at the time.

Mr. HERMANN. Well, the gentleman who reported the bill from that committee is present this evening.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] was present.

Mr. HERMANN. But, Mr. Chairman, rather than delay other pension legislation this evening, I will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL]. I know, of course, that I have the power under the rules to delay all legislation until this measure can be properly considered with a full quorum of the House present, but I have too much patriotism, and, if it comes to that, too much humanity, to desire that other cases should be deferred by keeping this case standing in the way, and for that reason I will agree to accept the amendment making the pension \$18, if that is the best proposition that gentlemen will permit to go through this evening.

I think the gentleman from Tennessee should be willing to consent to a pension of at least \$18 or \$20.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think this pension ought to be on the same footing as that of other widows.

Mr. SPOONER. If she is the widow of a captain the regular pension would be \$20.

Mr. McMILLIN. But she is not the widow of a captain.

Mr. SPOONER. I understand she is.

Mr. McMILLIN. My understanding was different.

Mr. HERMANN. Her father was a general; her brother, a colonel; and her husband, as I understand, a captain. I will agree to \$20 as a compromise.

Mr. McMILLIN. I thought the gentleman had accepted \$18.

Mr. HERMANN. Very well; I will accept \$18 rather than have further delay.

Mr. CHEADLE. I wish to say that we ought in these matters to follow the law. One-half an hour of the valuable time of the House this evening has been occupied in the consideration of a case that is to be rated outside of the ratings of the law. No greater truth was ever uttered than that uttered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] when he said that there is no higher title on this earth than that of American citizenship.

Mr. HERMANN. We all know that.

Mr. CHEADLE. And what is the pride of American citizenship if it be not that we are equal under the law? I shall object to the consideration of every one of these special bills unless there is a constitutional quorum present. I want to say to my Republican colleagues that the great central idea around which our party has rallied since its organization has been the equality of citizenship under the law. I have letters by the score from men of the rank and file of the Army, who have thanked me for the words I have said here in speaking for the equality of citizenship under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the position of the question. This bill proposes to grant a pension of \$50. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] has moved to amend by striking out "\$50" and inserting "\$18," and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] has moved to amend the amendment by striking out "\$18"

and inserting "12." The first question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN's amendment to the amendment was not agreed to. The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MORRILL, to strike out "50" and insert "18," it was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to further amend by striking out the words "only surviving daughter of George Wright, late brigadier-general of United States volunteers," and inserting "widow of — Owen, a soldier in the late war." I do not know what her husband's full name was; but my object is to put this pension upon the ground on which it ought to be granted. The fact that this woman is the daughter or granddaughter of somebody who was a general ought to be no foundation for a pension. I voted against pensioning the granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. McMILLIN, it was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHANNA LOEWINGER.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I call for the consideration of this bill. I am going to call for the consideration of every bill as it is reached on the Calendar.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Johanna Loewinger, widow of Charles Loewinger, deceased, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio), which was read in part, the further reading being dispensed with on motion of Mr. GUENTHER, is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger, having considered the same, report it back with the recommendation that it do pass, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, which is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 205, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"Charles Loewinger, the husband of the widow now claiming a pension, enlisted June 13, 1861, in Company E, Twenty-eighth Ohio Volunteers. Discharged for disability May 18, 1862. Application for a pension filed January 27, 1865, for chronic diarrhea and ulceration of the bowels. He died July 17, 1876. His widow filed her application to be put upon the pension-roll March 31, 1880; claim rejected July 25, 1885.

"The medical reviewer rejects the claim of the widow on the ground 'that the soldier committed suicide, as shown by the verdict of the coroner's jury, and his death in this manner is not considered the result of chronic diarrhea, nor chargeable in any way to his military service.' If the above finding is sustained by the evidence filed with the widow's application there could be no question that her claim had been properly rejected. On a careful analysis of the testimony the committee can not agree with the finding of the Pension Office, and is satisfied that the evidence clearly supports the opposite conclusion. "The verdict of the coroner's jury finds: 'The deceased came to his death from suicide by cutting his throat with a razor, caused by long-continued illness.'

"This verdict is supported as to the cause of his suicide by an overwhelming amount of testimony.

"The 'certificate of disability for discharge' finds him 'incapable of performing the duties of a soldier, because of chronic ulceration of the mucous membrane of the colon, resulting from an attack of camp fever contracted while on Big Sewell Mountain, in October, 1861, marked by excessive exhaustive diarrhea, occasional hemorrhage of the bowels, and such reduction of strength that he is utterly unfit for service.'

"The evidence of a number of physicians, as well as his neighbors, embracing the period from the date of his discharge to the hour of his death, conclusively proves that his disease, for which he was discharged from the service, continued, without intermission, during that whole period, and that he suffered excessive pain and was totally unfit to perform any labor, and that during the latter years of his life he was confined to his house, and most of the time to his bed; that his condition preyed upon his mind, and at times it was seriously affected.

"Dr. G. C. Werner, who attended him during the last years of his illness and at the time of his death, testified that—

"The soldier became affected with melancholy and became very debilitated several months before he committed suicide; that affiant never had any doubt but that the chronic diarrhea, from which he was continuously suffering, was the immediate cause of his melancholy; that death was not caused by cutting his throat, as affiant sewed up the wound and there were no arteries severed, and that, in affiant's opinion, he could not have lived more than a few days longer, as he was then in a dying condition from chronic diarrhea."

"This statement is supported by the affidavits of Neland Frenz, Dr. F. L. Emmert, Annie N. Rohrer, Mary Byer, Frank Geiler, Carl Kencher, and Carl Lirche.

"The medical reviewer, July 14, 1885, upon these facts, in referring the cause to the chief of the medical division, said: 'As the case now stands we must, in my opinion, accept death as due to diarrhea, and not to the wound in the throat.'

"This conclusion, which the committee think is fully sustained by the testimony, was reached after the medical reviewer had commented upon the case, May 6, 1885, and the medical referee himself had called for further testimony June 12, 1885.

"It is clear from the evidence that the pensioner was the victim of painful, exhausting, and debilitating disease; that no cause other than this disease is pretended to have existed which could have affected the mind of the husband of the petitioner and caused him to take his life. And it is fair to conclude that at the time he made the attempt on his life his mind, by reason of the disease contracted in the service, was seriously affected. And the evidence of the physician that he did not die from the injury inflicted, but as the result of his debilitated condition resulting from that disease, seems to your committee conclusive of the case.

"The conclusion of the committee in this case is fully sustained by the deci-

sions and rulings of the Pension Bureau, found in the 'Digest of Pension Laws and Decisions,' pages 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 279.

"Your committee would report the bill favorably, after amending the title so as to read: 'A bill granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;' and by striking out, in line 6, the word 'Johanna' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Johanna.'"

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BERRY DAY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Berry Day, father of A. L. Day, deceased, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill S. 737, having considered the same, report it back and recommend its passage, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 140, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

This claim was rejected by the Bureau of Pensions March 4, 1886, upon the ground that the claimant was not dependent upon the soldier for support at the date of his death.

The claimant is now eighty-one years of age. His only son, A. L. Day, of Company I, Fifth Ohio Infantry Volunteers, was killed at the battle of Cedar Mountain, in August, 1862. His mother died in 1847.

At the time of the soldier's death the father owned a house worth about \$2,000, which was under a mortgage of \$1,000. He had also about \$500 in personal property, and this was all of his estate. S. W. Bend and John W. Fisher depose that the son worked for his father up to near the time of his enlistment, and, as dependents understood, contributed his wages to aid his father. The claimant's business (trading in horses) was a constant loss to him until 1868, when he disposed of the last vestige of his property, and has ever since been supported by the labor of his second wife and by the Odd Fellows.

Mrs. Kate Fisher, sister of the deceased, deposes that this soldier sent her money nearly every pay-day to aid his father in supporting the family, amounting to some \$25 or \$30, and that he sent to his father much larger sums. The report of the board of examining surgeons, dated October 15, 1882, states that the claimant is incapable of supporting himself, and that the disability is senility.

The passage of this bill is recommended.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELIZA DOUGLASS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza Douglass, dependent mother of James Douglass, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Colored Troops.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass, having considered the same, report it back and recommend its passage, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 49, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"This is a claim for a pension by Eliza Douglass, as the dependent mother of James Douglass, a private in Company H, Fifth Regiment of Colored Troops.

"The proof in this case seems to be sufficient to show that the soldier, James Douglass, who enlisted on the 15th of June, 1863, and was discharged September 20, 1865, contracted the disease of which he subsequently died, April 15, 1870, whilst in the service of the United States and in the line of duty.

"The facts which would ordinarily justify the granting of a pension to the mother of a deceased soldier appear to be sufficiently established by the evidence. The only question presented by the record adverse to the claimant, Eliza Douglass, as the dependent mother of James Douglass, is the fact that the proof is conclusive that at the time of the death of the said James Douglass he left a widow, who some time subsequent to his death married.

"Section 4707 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides—
"If any person embraced within the provisions of sections 4692 and 4693 has died since the 4th day of March, 1861, or shall hereafter die by reason of any wound, injury, casualty, or disease which under the conditions and limitations of such sections would have entitled him to an invalid pension, and has not left or shall not leave a widow or legitimate child, but has left or shall leave other relative or relatives who were dependent upon him for support in whole or in part at the date of his death, such relative or relatives shall be entitled in the following order of precedence to receive the same pension as such person would have been entitled to had he been totally disabled, to commence at the death of such person."

"This section clearly contemplates that the right of a dependent relative to a pension shall accrue only in those cases in which the soldier dying has not left a 'widow' or 'legitimate child.'

"Section 4708 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides—
"The remarriage of any widow, dependent mother, or dependent sister entitled to pension shall not bar her right to such pension to the date of her remarriage."

"But on the remarriage of any widow, dependent mother, or dependent sister having a pension, such pension shall cease."

"The committee know of no provision of law which authorizes the substitution of a dependent mother to the rights which the law gives to the widow of a deceased soldier in case said widow should marry after the death of her husband, section 4708 not applying to such a case.

"This view was taken by the Pension Bureau in the above claim, and the right of the claimant to a pension denied on this construction of the law. Under these circumstances the action of the Commissioner of Pensions in rejecting the claim was correct under the law as it exists.

"But the committee in this case feel compelled to report the above bill favorably under the circumstances disclosed by this record, and recommend that the bill be passed."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I was present, as I have been almost every pension night, and the rule has been for the Calendar to be gone through with and to consider bills which are not objected to. Under that rule gentlemen have passed four or five bills which they have had an interest in in behalf of soldiers' widows in the State from which they come. I have introduced bills now upon the Calendar which were in the interest of soldiers of the State of New Jersey. It was understood last Friday that to-night bills were to be taken up beginning where we left off on last Friday. I do not see any possible way of reaching bills in the interest of New Jersey unless we clear the Calendar as we go along. If we had gone on in that way we would have gotten through the Calendar by this time, and could have commenced again at the beginning, but as we have gone on I do not see any chance to reach the bills in which I am interested. Now, I would rather go on and consider the bills as they come up on the Calendar and dispose of them. But if the committee will agree to take up the Calendar where we left off on last Friday, so that we may consider such cases as are called up, then I am willing to withdraw all further objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pending bill.

There was no objection, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

C. R. THOMAS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S 335) granting a pension to C. R. Thomas.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

MARY E. JOHNSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 337) granting a pension to Mary E. Johnson.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that if he undertakes to call up bills in every case when they are reached, without the request of the gentlemen who are interested, it may be that they would not regard it as courteous on his part.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

MANON VANGORDEN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 330) granting a pension to Manon Vangorden.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN GERMAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of John German.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Bills of the following titles were passed over, no member asking for their consideration:

- A bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of Julia Triggs;
- A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch; and
- A bill (S. 1638) granting a pension to William Richardson.

JOHN TAYLOR.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor.

Mr. CHEADLE. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to increase the pension of John Taylor, late of Battery M, Third New York Light Artillery, from \$12 to \$16 per month, on account of gunshot wound of the head and its results.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

A similar bill was before the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the Forty-ninth Congress, and their report thereon is as follows:

"The applicant for pension is now receiving a pension of \$12 a month by an act of Congress approved May 4, 1882.

"On the 5th day of November, 1884, he applied to the Department for an increase on account of disabilities incurred while in the service, and was rejected by the Department upon the certificate of the examining board, made November 4, 1885, which is as follows:

"Ball entered 2 inches below and behind the right angle of the mouth, injuring the inferior maxilla and passing through the structure of the lower portion of the mouth, coming out an inch above and to the left of the pomum Adami; cicatrices are depressed and adherent; there is considerable allia, probably owing to the injury of the nerves of the tongue; there is no external evidence of injury to the left shoulder, but there is apparent slight loss of sensation of face and of left shoulder.

"Examining Surgeon S. A. Lumly certifies to gunshot wound fracturing inferior maxillary right jaw; ball entering lower border of the inferior maxillary, passing inwards and emerging from left jaw below inferior maxillary, removing several molars and causing partial paralysis of vocal organs and impairing speech; considerable pain in cold weather; atrophied condition of left jaw; facial neuralgia; health impaired; degrees of disability permanent."

"Examining Surgeon George Kellogg and others certify substantially as last above, and add that articulation is much impaired; that claimant at times is

unable to speak; has difficulty in mastication. Claimant says his articulation was perfect before he was wounded; has loss of power in left arm and hand; circulation slightly impaired, probably due to injury to filaments of cervical flexus.

"The claimant claims an increase of disability on account of the injuries received while in the service.

"He has personally appeared before the committee, and it is evident that he is incapable of using his left arm so that he may earn his livelihood by manual labor; that he is also afflicted with a painful and embarrassing stammering of his speech, arising from the gunshot wound above referred to.

"From the evidence presented, and his personal appearance and examination by the committee, the committee are of the opinion that claimant is entitled to a further rating than he already has, namely, \$16 per month, and that the bill be amended by striking out the words 'twenty-four,' in lines 7 and 8, and inserting instead thereof the word 'sixteen.'"

The bill then under consideration passed both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by the President on the ground that the increase allowed under the act approved May 4, 1882, "when applied for at the Pension Bureau in 1885, was denied, on the ground that the rate he was receiving was commensurate with the degree of his disability, a board of surgeons having reported that he was receiving a liberal rating."

Your committee concede that the disability is liberally rated on the basis provided by law, i. e., ability to perform manual labor, and that as far as the Pension Bureau is permitted under the terms of the law to go. But this case is of a different character. It is not as much claimant's inability to perform manual labor which induces him to come to Congress for relief as his inability to procure employment by reason of the very serious impairment of his speech. Impairment of speech and deafness alike, while not an interference in the performance of manual labor, subject the unfortunate individual to much embarrassment in obtaining employment, and Congress already has taken the necessary steps to grant relief to those who are totally deaf.

Recognizing the merit of the bill under consideration, your committee report favorably on the same, and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

W. A. LEMASTER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 647) for the relief of W. A. Lemaster; which was passed over, no member asking for its consideration.

HANNAH H. LATHAM.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8506) for the relief of Hannah H. Latham; which was passed over, no member asking for its consideration.

B. S. VAN BUREN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, the name of Barent S. Van Buren, late a musician in the Fourth Regiment of Illinois Cavalry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren, submit the following report:

The case of Barent S. Van Buren, formerly a musician of the Fourth Illinois Cavalry Volunteers (claim for invalid pension No. 389982), was rejected by the Pension Office September 17, 1885, on the ground that the evidence on file in the case did not show that tumors of breast and thigh originated in the service and the line of duty.

The history of this case is as follows: Soldier, who was the son of Judge E. Van Buren, of Chicago, was a musician and joined the regiment composed of the Fourth Illinois Cavalry Volunteers in October, 1861; was discharged with the other members of the band at Cairo in the spring of 1862. The testimony on file in this case in the Pension Office goes to show that soldier contracted tumors of chest, abdomen, and thigh, on the march from Fort Henry to Fort Donelson, Tennessee, in February, 1862. The weather was wet and cold, and the constant riding day and night, and the constant exposure, brought on sickness, which resulted in said tumors, which were hard and soft alternately and at times suppurated; always tender and troublesome.

These tumors existed at the date of discharge in April, 1862, and Dr. Joseph W. Freer, who treated him immediately after arriving home after discharge for these tumors, is dead, and soldier has been unable to furnish the testimony of a commissioned officer of the regiment as to the incurrence of his disability in the service, owing to the fact that the members of the band were not with the regiment when traversing the country from Fort Henry to Fort Donelson, Tennessee.

He has furnished the testimony of the different members of the band who were with him at the time, and to whom he showed his tumors at Randolph Forges in February, 1862, after the ride across the country.

The testimony shows that he was a strong, healthy man when he enlisted, by parties who knew him. This is shown by several witnesses, and that he was afflicted as above set forth on his return from the Army. It is certain from the testimony on file that this man was sound and well when he enlisted, and it is equally certain that he was discharged because of his sickness which he contracted after his enlistment. It seems that by an equitable construction this claimant contracted this disability while in the service and in line of duty.

Therefore the committee recommend that this bill do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Bills of the following titles were passed over, no members asking for their consideration:

- A bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch;
- A bill (H. R. 5123) to increase the pension of Charles Ritchey;
- A bill (H. R. 4182) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jones;
- A bill (H. R. 3509) granting a pension to Harriet I. Peabody; and
- A bill (H. R. 7932) granting a pension to Mary Calvert Truxtun.

MRS. F. SELINA BUCHANAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan, widow of the late McKean Buchanan, of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension of \$50 per month, in lieu of the amount she is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred Senate bill 1985, adopt the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, and recommend the passage of the bill.

"The petitioner, Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan, is the widow of the late McKean Buchanan, who, at the time of his death, March 18, 1871, was pay director in the United States Navy, with the rank of commodore (the highest attainable by officers of his grade), assimilated to that of brigadier-general in the Army.

"Pay Director Buchanan entered the Navy in 1826, and participated in two wars. By act of Congress of December 21, 1861, limiting the term of active service to forty-five years of service, or to sixty-two years of age, he was retired from service, he having been born in 1798. Although by this law permitted to withdraw from active duty, he remained at his post on board the frigate Congress until she was sunk in Hampton Roads, March 9, 1862. During the engagement with the Merrimack on the date named he commanded the berth-deck division and performed gallant service until the sinking of the ship.

"Being at that time sixty-four years of age, the shock to his system was such that his health was seriously undermined, and his death was the result.

"By the act of March 3, 1871, revising the various naval grades, Paymaster Buchanan was raised to the grade of pay director (then newly created) with the rank of commodore, but his death occurred two weeks later, on March 18, 1871, before the issuance of his commission.

"In view of the foregoing facts, of the decedent's long and valuable services, of the widow's advanced age, she being over eighty-three years old, and in view of the further fact that there are now, or were not long since, on the pension-rolls the widows of ten admirals, four commodores, and a number of other officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, receiving \$50 per month, your committee recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be granted, and they submit herewith a bill increasing her pension from \$30 to \$50."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the bill will be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no desire to discuss the general propositions contained in this bill. It is so thoroughly in keeping with every bill reported from the Committee of the Whole, having passed the Senate and been reported from the House committee, that I can not understand the gentleman's objection. But I desire to be consistent with the record that the House has made on every bill submitted embodying this proposition, and as the gentleman, I am sure, desires to be consistent in his opposition to the principle involved, I am perfectly willing to entertain any suggestion coming from the committee with reference to the bill, in order that it may not delay proceedings with respect to other bills following it on the Calendar and yet at the same time give to the bill consideration of the same character that other bills have always received.

Mr. MORRILL. I move to amend the bill by striking out "fifty" and inserting "thirty-five."

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall not object to letting the bill go to the House on such an amendment as that. I only want the House to pass upon the question.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object to \$35 as well as fifty.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. CHEADLE. No, sir. I am not in charge of the bill. I will state to my colleague on the committee that a number of similar cases have been set down for the 28th of the month, directly after the reading of the Journal, and I am perfectly willing that this bill shall take the same course.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman submit any motion?

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to amend by inserting \$30 per month.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what she now gets. I am willing, if it be the judgment of the committee to fix \$35 as the rate, to let the House pass upon the question involved, as it has done in similar cases.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit a suggestion.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. Why not allow it to take the same course as the other bills set for consideration in the House on the 28th of May?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no objection to that, as I have said. Does the gentleman mean at \$35?

Mr. FORD. No; just as it stands.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. TAUBEE. Let the recommendation of the committee be that the bill go over to the 28th day of May with the previous question ordered, but with the right of amendment, and with fifteen minutes' debate on each side.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am perfectly willing for that.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

Mr. MORRILL. If that agreement is entered into I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection this bill will be reported to the House with the understanding that a vote is to be taken

on it in the House on the 28th day of May, following the bills which have been similarly reported for consideration on that day, with fifteen minutes' debate on each side and the previous question being considered as ordered, with the right, however, to offer amendments.

There was no objection.

ANDREW FRANKLIN, ALIAS M'KEE.

The next bill on the Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. RYAN, was the bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew Franklin, alias McKee, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving under an act of Congress approved February 23, 1855.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

They recommend the favorable consideration thereof, and adopt the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, as follows:

"The claimant was a soldier in the Mexican war, and is now about ninety-five years of age. By special act, approved February 23, 1855, he was granted a pension at \$8 per month. He now asks for an increase of the same to \$30 per month. The testimony which was produced before the committee at the time the bill granting him a pension was pending shows that the claimant saw hard service in the war with Mexico and was wounded in action.

"On account of the great age, the infirmities, and the total dependence of the claimant, the committee are of opinion that the increase should be allowed. They therefore recommend the passage of the bill."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MOSES L. CHASE.

The next business on the Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. GROUT, was the bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be hereby directed to put upon the pension-roll, subject to the limitations and restrictions of the pension laws, the name of Moses L. Chase, a private in Company M, First Vermont Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase, having considered the same, report as follows:

The claimant was a private in Company M, First Vermont Cavalry, being enrolled August 27, 1864, for three years. The records show that soldier participated in several battles. It is also shown that he had hospital service at Chapel Point, Md., for intermittent fever; at the Armory Square Hospital, Washington, D. C., for chronic diarrhea, and at the Baxter Hospital, Burlington, Vt., and the Sloan Hospital, Montpelier, Vt., for the latter disease. His treatment at Montpelier, Vt., was in June, 1865, shortly after which he was mustered out.

Soldier made application for pension, alleging chronic diarrhea, and also kidney disease, resulting from being thrown from a horse at Harper's Ferry, W. Va., by which his back was severely injured.

There is medical evidence on file showing that soldier is now incurably sick with kidney and bladder disease, the board of examining surgeons of Newport, Vt., giving this opinion, and there is also both medical and lay evidence showing that when he came home from the army he was very feeble with chronic diarrhea and kidney disease.

The case was submitted for special examination to Homer Riggs, and after a very thorough inquiry the examiner made a favorable report, closing as follows:

"The evidence of Samuel F. Stearns, who is considered one of the most reliable men in his town, shows beyond a reasonable doubt that the soldier was thrown from a horse and hurt, and was taken up by his comrades unconscious. From the evidence before me, I am of the opinion that the claim is meritorious."

Notwithstanding this favorable finding, the claim was rejected, and as your committee are fully persuaded that the claim is a thoroughly just one, and that a hardship has been done the soldier by its rejection in the Pension Office, report it back favorably and recommend its passage, with an amendment substituting the word "place" for the word "put" in the third line.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LAURA L. WALLEN.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I inadvertently allowed the bill just preceding this on the Calendar to be passed over. I now ask that it be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5593) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. Wallen.

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 increase the pension to Laura L. Wallen, widow of Henry D. Wallen, late colonel of the Second Infantry, United States Army, to the sum of \$50 per month.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I do not desire to consider this bill now; but I ask that it go over to the 28th of May, under the same conditions precisely as those bills preceding it.

Mr. CARUTH. I do not object to the request of the gentleman; but how are we to dispose of the number of bills which are fixed for that day?

Mr. RYAN. If not disposed of on that day they will go over to another day.

Mr. CARUTH. I have a bill set for consideration on that day which I do not want interfered with.

Mr. MCKINNEY. This will not interfere with it or any previous bills.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the report read.

The report (by Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut) was read, as follows:

That Laura L. Wallen is the widow of Henry D. Wallen, who at the time of his death, December, 1887, was colonel of Second Infantry. The records of the War Department show that Colonel Wallen was appointed in 1836 and served in the Mexican war, and in each grade of promotion upon the frontier, until his death, which was from disease contracted upon the frontier of Arizona. The most notable service of Colonel Wallen's life, in obedience to orders most distasteful to an officer anxious for military distinction and rank, was performed during the late war.

His knowledge of the Indian tribes and his great tact and judgment in dealing with them pointed to him as a man suited to the arduous and delicate task of dealing with the warlike tribes of Apaches and Navajos on the frontier of New Mexico. Though averse to this service in the condition of the country, as his letters to the War Department, to President Lincoln, and to the Military Committee of the Senate show, he complied with the orders of the Secretary of War with such zeal and energy that though commanding but three companies of his regiment, composed of fresh volunteers, he kept the frontier, that for a century had been exposed to the violence of savage tribes, in a condition of peace that it had rarely known.

About 2,000 Indians were brought into a reservation, disarmed, and induced to labor, land was reclaimed by irrigation, crops planted and harvested in peace, while all the energies of the Government were engaged in the prodigious work of war. The value of this frontier service can scarcely be overrated; but for the discretion and executive ability of Colonel Wallen the whole frontier of New Mexico would have blazed with the fires of savage warfare, and the Government embarrassed at a time when it had no forces to spare.

This continuous service in a hot and unhealthy region broke down Colonel Wallen's health, and after years of suffering he died, leaving a widow, advanced in years, and an invalid daughter dependent upon a pension of \$30 per month.

In view of Colonel Wallen's services, and the present condition of his widow, the committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire on what ground it is asked that an increase shall be given in this case beyond that given in other cases of a similar character?

Mr. McKINNEY. Because of the services given to his country, and because the widow to-day is entirely dependent upon her pension. We have many precedents for this kind of increase.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish the gentleman would name some of them, because I am not familiar with any.

Mr. McKINNEY. I think there are quite a number, if the gentleman will look.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask the gentleman from Kansas if that is the course of his committee?

Mr. MORRILL. The Committee on Invalid Pensions never recommended such a case. Indeed, in the case of Colonel Hendricks, who was killed in battle, the committee reported adversely on a similar application.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio. This case comes from the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. MORRILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKINNEY. I do not object to the bill going over to the 28th of May, under the same order as has been adopted with regard to other bills. The House can then discuss the bill, and can pass it or kill it, as it pleases.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let it go over with the right to offer amendments.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not object to the bill going over with the right to be voted on in the House. But I do object seriously to the practice of selecting out some cases of this class to the exclusion of others.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri). Is there objection to the proposition that the bill shall go over to be considered in the House under the conditions which have been stated?

There was no objection, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation stated.

EVELINE M. ALEXANDER.

The next bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SAWYER) was the bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander.

Mr. SAWYER. This is a bill where a widow is now receiving a pension of \$30. The bill recommends a pension of \$50 per month. Her husband was wounded while serving in the Army with the rank of brigadier-general. I ask that this bill take the same course as others and be considered in the House on the 28th of May under the same order, with the right to offer amendments.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the bill and report be read.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman who calls up this bill does not desire to have the bill now considered.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask to have it considered merely to the extent of its being ordered to take the same course as the others.

Mr. McMILLIN. If that action is to be taken, the bill and the report should be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eveline M. Alexander, and rate her pension at \$50 per month, which shall be in lieu of the pension she now receives.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander, submit the following report:

It appears from the report of the Adjutant-General, on file in the Pension Office, that General Alexander entered the regular Army of the United States July 26, 1861, as second lieutenant, and remained until May 4, 1867, when he died, holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel. He served as adjutant-general of the Third Army Corps of Army of the Potomac, and of the Seventeenth Corps of the Department of the Tennessee. Served as chief of staff to General Stoneman, commanding Department of the Tennessee, and also inspector-general in 1865. Subsequently served with his regiment and in other capacities in Arkansas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, and Montana. That in 1895 he was retired from active service in consequence of disabilities incurred in the line of duty as an officer of the Army.

It appears that in 1865 he commanded the Second Brigade, Fourth Division Cavalry Corps, Military Division of the Mississippi.

Mrs. Alexander is now receiving a pension of \$30 per month as the widow of a lieutenant-colonel.

The evidence shows that she is a lady, in ordinary circumstances, with a young son, about twelve years of age, and at that age when the expenses of education are rapidly increasing.

The letter from General Wilson, one of the most distinguished cavalry officers of the Army, addressed to one of the committee, is annexed hereto and made a part of this report.

The committee believe that this lady, the widow of so distinguished an officer, who bravely commanded a brigade while in active service, who was in fact a brevet brigadier-general, there being no vacancy in the full rank, is under the circumstances fairly entitled to the relief this bill seeks to give, and therefore recommend that the bill pass.

WASHINGTON, March 14, 1888.

SIR: I beg to call your attention to the claim of Eveline M. Alexander, wife of the late General Andrew S. Alexander, for an increase of pension.

It was my good fortune to know General Alexander during the rebellion—appointed into the Army from Missouri, and by conspicuous merit rose to the command of a brigade of cavalry in the corps which I had the honor of organizing and commanding. Prior to that he was a lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general of the Seventeenth Army Corps, on the staff of his brother-in-law, Maj. Gen. Frank Blair.

After serving with me as chief of staff through the Nashville campaign, during which he rendered most valuable service, I secured for him the rank of brevet brigadier-general (it being understood that he could not be appointed to the full rank because there were no vacancies in that grade), and assigned him to the command of a brigade of cavalry in Upton's (Fourth) division, which command he held during the final campaign through Alabama and Georgia, with which the war was ended. He greatly distinguished himself in the battles at Montealto, Ebenezer Church, the assault and capture of Selma, the passage of the Alabama, the assault and capture of Columbus, Ga., and finally in the operations which resulted in the capture of Jefferson Davis.

In all these battles and operations he was conspicuous for the energy, courage, activity, and ability with which he commanded and led his brigade. He was constantly under my observation, and I most cheerfully bear witness to his high qualities and character, as well as to the untiring industry and persistency with which he performed every duty.

I was personally a witness to an incident which I do not doubt was proximately the cause of his death. During the passage of the Alabama by the corps on a ponton bridge, built for the occasion, Alexander, with a small boat and crew, was trying to protect the bridge from the drift-wood with which the river was filled by the rapidly rising flood. An enormous tree caught his frail craft between it and the bridge, overturned the craft, threw the general into the water, and as he arose to the surface and seized the bow one of the pontons caught and crowded him almost to death.

He was rescued with great difficulty; two of his ribs were broken, his back was severely injured, and his lungs badly bruised. Twenty-two years afterwards, while suffering from disease directly the result of his long and faithful services, he died from the bursting of an abscess on his lungs, which I doubt not had its origin from the injury just described. He was at the time in the line of his duty as a brigadier-general, and it was not his fault that he did not hold the full rank. He was regularly assigned to command before that date as a brevet brigadier-general, and for all purposes of the military service and for the law he was just as much a brigadier-general as a dozen appointments to that grade could have made him. He commanded and was obeyed as such, he was injured as such, and now that he is dead, leaving his wife and young son dependent upon the justice and liberality of his country, I submit that they should receive a pension according to his services and command as a brigadier-general and not according to the lineal rank he had when he died.

I am well acquainted with Mrs. Alexander and her father's family, one of the most distinguished in New York, and am sure she has no support and no means of educating her young son except what she derives from the small pension now allowed her and from the meager saving from her husband's army pay, which he invested several years before he became disabled.

She needs, and ought to have, the largest pension ever paid under such circumstances, and no one who will take time to read the little volume I prepared and which his wife published, giving an account of his life and services, can doubt the justice of this conclusion.

He was a brave, virtuous, heroic soldier, and of the highest character in all the relations of life, and as the actual commission of brigadier-general of volunteers could have imposed no additional service, danger, or command upon him, I trust his widow's petition may be promptly granted. He who gives quickly, gives twice. In this case I hope there will be no delay.

If deemed necessary, I will cheerfully make affidavit to the truth of the foregoing statement.

Perhaps I should add that General Alexander was also the brother-in-law of Major General Upton, of New York, and that young Upton Alexander is now the sole representative of those two most gallant and patriotic soldiers and is dependent upon this increased pension for the education a boy of such lineage should receive.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JAMES H. WILSON,

Late Maj. Gen. Vol., Comdg. Cav. Corps M. D. M.,
and Brevet Maj. Gen., U. S. A.

Hon. JOHN G. SAWYER,

House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion that the bill be reported to the House with the recommendation that it shall go over for consideration in the House on the 28th of May, with the previous question ordered, fifteen minutes of debate on each side, and the right to offer amendments. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

HARLOW B. HYDE.

The next business on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration by Mr. SAWYER, was the bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harlow B. Hyde, dependent father of George B. Hyde, late a private in Company C, Second Wisconsin Infantry.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde, submit the following report:

The committee, from an examination of the very full statement of the facts as contained in the report of the Senate committee on this bill, hereto attached and made a part hereof, find that this is a meritorious claim, and therefore they recommend that the bill do pass.

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Harlow B. Hyde, have examined the same, and report:

Harlow B. Hyde is the father of George B. Hyde, late private in Company C, Second Wisconsin Infantry. From the record testimony it is shown that the soldier was enrolled on the 22d day of April, 1861; that he was wounded in action August 28, 1862; that he received his wound at the battle of Gainesville, and that he died from its effects on the 10th of September, 1862. The father claims that he was dependent upon his said son at the time of his enlistment, and on the 17th of April, 1883, he filed an application for a pension. The claim was rejected October 7, 1883, on the ground that the claimant's physical condition was not satisfactorily shown, neither his property or income at that date; that the contributions from his son are shown by the testimony of the family, which consisted of himself—the mother having died before the war—and a daughter nineteen years of age.

Apart from his immediate household he had a married son, aged twenty-nine, three unmarried sons, two of whom were in the Army. Another objection to the allowance of his claim consisted in his having a home, which he sold for \$1,000, from the proceeds of which \$150 had to go for debts. It is also held that the evidence does not show that his physical infirmities prevented his earning a living. He appealed from the decision of the Commissioner, but the Secretary of the Interior sustained the rejection.

The committee are of the opinion that there is ample proof, independent of that contributed by claimant's family, to show that he was dependent upon his son for support, and it consists in the fact that the son lived with his father before and at the time of his enlistment; that he labored for his father's maintenance, and in the well-established fact that the father was unable to labor for his own support.

Dr. L. F. Benedict, Winooski, Vt., testifies as follows:

"Has attended claimant for the last fourteen years (prior to July 3, 1883, covering a period from 1869) for rheumatism. Is unable to give dates, as his pecuniary circumstances forbade the idea of much pay. When able to pay he did so at the time of service. Also had a right inguinal hernia. Since 1869 has been quite infirm. That his age is now seventy-nine. Know him to be truthful, honest, and industrious, when able to work, and too proud to ask the Government for a pension if he did not believe it to be his legal and moral right."

The surgeon's certificate of examination, made at Burlington, Vt., describes his condition as follows:

"We find an elastic soft tumor in right groin. It protrudes from external abdominal ring; is size of butternut, or about 1½ inches in diameter. It is an oblique inguinal hernia. He has moderately varicose veins of right leg. The facts of duration of above condition are not within our personal knowledge, but in our best judgment these conditions were present for several years previous to late war. We also believe that in consequence of such disabilities he was unfitted for manual labor."

Then follows the rating, which is total.

The report, which is official, shows that in the best judgment of the examiners the conditions they describe existed prior to the war. Assuming that they are correct—and their statement is corroborated by that of Dr. Benedict—the claimant was a dependent father when his son enlisted. He was dependent before, since, and is now. The son contributed to his support up to the time of his death, for he had no income from any other source, and the only property he had he sold for \$1,000, upon which there was a mortgage of \$300.

At the time of his son's enlistment he was fifty-eight years old, was afflicted with inguinal hernia and other disabilities—was disqualified for manual labor. He was dependent, and upon whom if not upon his son, who lived with him and was his sole support? He is now eighty-four years of age, and the pension to which he is plainly entitled, in the opinion of the committee, has been too long withheld.

The accompanying bill is reported for his relief with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

GEORGE W. PEAVEY.

Mr. CLARK. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey, just preceding the one last considered.

There was no objection.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Peavey, late first lieutenant Fifty-seventh United States Colored Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey, have examined the same, and report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions on this case, hereto attached and made a part hereof, contains a full statement in detail of the facts in this case. Your committee are led to believe that it is a meritorious case, and would therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of George W. Peavey, have examined the same, and report:

This case is fully explained in the report of the committee made at the last session of Congress, which is as follows:

"The petitioner made application to the Pension Office on April 12, 1884, and his application was rejected; and he now appeals to Congress for the aid to which he thinks he is entitled, and which it is evident he needs. His term of service embraces the time from July, 1861, to October, 1866. He enlisted as a private in Company B, First New York Cavalry, and was discharged June 13, 1865, that he might be promoted to a Lieutenancy. At the time of his promotion the colonel of his regiment says:

"He has served in my regiment nearly four years. He is a meritorious soldier, and I think well worthy of promotion. He is efficient, intelligent, and of good repute."

"James A. Hudson, an attorney of New York City, says he was an enlisted man in the same regiment with the petitioner; that he knew him during all the time of their service, and has known him ever since; that he has been in the habit of seeing him every week and oftener. In his affidavit he refers to his knowledge of his severe complaining some time after 1870, and of his continued suffering from that time to the present. The petitioner produces the testimony of his attending physicians to show that his disability is great, and that it severely affects his back and one leg."

"The Pension Office rejection is on the ground that he has had no pensionable disability since the date of filing his claim, April 12, 1884. If he had a pensionable disability prior to filing his claim, and contracted it in the service, he would have a claim to a pension during the prevalence of such disability."

"The Adjutant-General's report shows that during the last year of his service he was four times reported sick, and twice on special duty. He believes and claims that his helplessness was caused by sleeping over the steam-pipes on a transportation boat. The record gives no account of the nature of his sickness while in the Army. It never does, and he is unable to procure official testimony as to his condition prior to discharge. He hoped to subsist without a pension, but he became almost helplessly disabled, lost his property, and was compelled to appeal to the Government for what he deemed to be due him. He is now seventy years old."

"His case seems to have merit, but he has had no attorney, and it is not well prepared. In the opinion of the committee, though the evidence is not such as is required by the Pension Office, his illness is due to his service. It is the experience of any careful observer that but very few of those who served in the late war have escaped disabling diseases. This man served about five continuous years. He was very faithful and of good repute. In any case he will not require the aid he asks very long, and it is better to give it to him upon the shadow of a doubt than he has not technically made out a case than to commit the injustice of withholding it if it is his due."

"Your committee report a bill for his relief with a recommendation that it do pass."

It appears from the record reports that this soldier enlisted July 12, 1861, and was discharged October 23, 1866. It is also proven from this source that during the five years of his service he is always reported "present for duty," or "present, sick." James A. Hudson, whose testimony is in part quoted in the previous report, says that he knew him while serving with him in 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864, and after an interval of two or three years their intimacy was renewed.

"Through all of these years I have known that he claimed and believed that the injuries from which he suffered were received while in the Army and in the line of duty."

The Pension Office called for testimony as to his treatment in hospital during his service. His answer was that he was not treated in hospital at any time, but in his own quarters, being an officer. Then the regimental surgeon's statement was required, which he declares emphatically that he procured and forwarded to the Pension Office. No notice was taken of this, and he says that his repeated requests to be informed as to whether the affidavit of his surgeon has been received or not have not been noticed.

It is true, as stated in the previous report, that his case has not been properly completed. He had no attorney, and depended upon his friends and his own efforts to procure proper testimony. To the committee it is evident that he was sound when he entered the service. It is beyond question that he was accepted as such. His service during the years was uninterrupted and without a cloud. His reputation is vouched for by some of the best citizens of New York. Without an exception he is rated as a temperate, honest, reputable man. He gives as a reason for delaying his application that so long as he was able to support himself he would not become a pensioner; but a change came. The little property which he and his wife had saved is gone; his health entirely failed; age is coming on, and dependence stares him in the face. It may be added, as shown by statements of his neighbors and friends, that he is utterly dependent, and is now supported by those who respect and pity him.

The Commissioner of Pensions states that his claim was rejected "on the ground that there has been no pensionable disability since the filing of his claim." This rejection is based upon the reports of the medical examiners before whom he was ordered.

Physicians who have examined him differ very materially from the doctors appointed by the Government. Dr. Holbrook, of New York, says:

"Mr. Peavey has been carefully examined by me, and I find him suffering from chronic bronchitis and partial paralysis of nerves controlling bladder and sexual organs. As near as I can trace the origin of his troubles, they had their first cause in exposure as a soldier in the war. While thoroughly opposed to granting pensions on slight pretext and without searching investigation, I am strongly inclined to believe Mr. Peavey is entitled to one. At any rate, he is entitled to a most thorough and impartial hearing."

Dr. Thomas W. Ogden, of New York, certifies, "from a sense of duty," as follows:

"I have had an intimate personal acquaintance with Mr. Peavey for a number of years and know him to be an unusually worthy and honest man. I have not the least hesitancy in stating that he has an entirely just claim against the Government, payment of which has doubtless been withheld from the fact that his case has not been properly investigated. I have examined Mr. Peavey's memorial, herewith exhibited, and can vouch for the truthfulness of all statements made concerning his impaired health and pecuniary embarrassment, and it is my candid belief that these conditions are the direct result of the exposure to which he was subjected during the five years of his service as a soldier in the Union Army."

"I know Mr. Peavey's claim to be based upon facts which make the Government his debtor, and hence I earnestly commend him and his case to the confidence and sympathy of all who have the power to aid him in securing recompense for the disabilities entailed through the hard service he rendered the nation at a time when, had he devoted his time and energies to making money, he could, without risk of life or exposure inimical to health, have placed himself in independent circumstances."

The committee are of the opinion that the prayer of the petitioner should be granted, and report the accompanying bill for his relief.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider the bill (S. 2356) which is found on page 82 of the Calendar.

Mr. CHEADLE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. DOCKERY resumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MARY GAMMELL.

The next bill on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration

by Mr. SAWYER, was the bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Gammell, widow of Andrew Gammell, late private in Company C, Thirty-fourth Massachusetts Infantry.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell, submit the following report:

The full and convincing facts in this case, as appears in the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, hereto attached and made a part hereof, convince the committee that this is a just case, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 13, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Mary Gammell, widow of Andrew Gammell, have examined the same, and report:

Andrew Gammell, the late husband of the petitioner, was a private in Company C, Thirty-fourth Massachusetts Regiment. From the report made by the Adjutant-General to the Commissioner of Pensions, it appears that he was wounded on the 15th of May, 1864, and sent to the hospital at Frederick, Md. This wound is thus described by an examining surgeon:

"A ball passed in near the spine on a level with left shoulder; passed deep under muscles of neck out in front."

For this disability the soldier was pensioned September 2, 1869, from January 21, 1866, at \$4 per month. During the subsequent years he applied for increase, and was rejected. He died at Holden, Mass., December 10, 1882, and on the 25th of January, 1886, his widow applied for pension, which was rejected on the ground that the evidence did not connect the death with the wound.

From the affidavit of Dr. I. O. West, of Princeton, Mass., filed with the soldier's application for invalid pension, it is shown that—

"He has suffered a good deal from pain, soreness, and lameness of left shoulder, extending up the neck to a tumor, which was developed immediately after a gunshot wound received during the late civil war. He had a great deal of severe pain in his left side, and on one or two occasions I have treated him for inflammation of lung and pleura of left side."

The affiant says he is disqualified for labor to any extent, and that his disability is the result of his wound. This testimony was given August 13, 1869.

Dr. James G. Shannon, a resident of Rutland, Mass., and late hospital steward, United States Army, testifies in support of the widow's claim as follows:

"That the late Andrew Gammell came under my care in January, 1879, and he continued under my care the greater part of the time until his death, December 10, 1882. He died of consumption, and I always believed that the gunshot wound in the lower part of the neck was the primary cause. During my acquaintance with him he was never able to support his family."

In a subsequent affidavit the same witness says:

"He died of consumption, caused, I believe, by a bullet wound near the apex of, I think, the left lung. A large tumor had formed at that point and extended up the neck."

Dr. Joseph S. Ames, of Holden, Mass., testifies that the disease of which he died was induced by the bullet wound received while in the service. In a subsequent affidavit the same affiant says:

"I have for a long term of years been well acquainted with the late Andrew Gammell, and have at different times prescribed for him; that his death, occurring on the 10th day of December, 1882, was caused by consumption, and that the primary cause of his disease was a gunshot wound in the neck. Of this opinion I am well satisfied."

M. V. B. Jefferson, a resident of Worcester, testifies that—

"He knew Andrew Gammell long before the war; that Gammell worked for him on his farm before he enlisted, and he never knew but what he was a strong and healthy man. After he came home from the war he lived in my house and worked for me until he died, when he was able to work, but there was a good deal of the time when he was not able to do anything. He had a large bunch on the back of his neck, where he was shot, and a bad cough a long time before he died. I think the wound was the cause of his death. He was sick a long time before he died, and he used to complain of the back of his head and neck, and had a good deal of trouble with his lungs about breathing, especially if he had a cold."

The examining surgeon, before whom the soldier was ordered during the pendency of his application for invalid pension, says in his report—

"The disability is permanent. I find a ball hit opposite the seventh cervical vertebra, passed deep under the muscles of the neck, out at the left side of the same, leaving that shoulder and arm weak, lame, and painful."

The board of surgeons at Worcester, who examined the soldier on his application for increase, say in their report:

"A ball passed in near the spine on a level with left shoulder; passed deep under muscles of neck out in front."

The testimony from all sources is positive as to the nature, extent, and severity of the wound. It is shown that his disability was nearly total, and yet he was allowed the meager pension of \$4 a month.

All the evidence filed with the widow's application positively and unequivocally connects the death with the wound, nor is there any evidence to the contrary. The examining surgeons say "they find a large tumor above the wound, but having no connection with it." It is not pretended that there was any fatal tendency in the existence of the tumor. It is assumed and proved by physicians of the highest respectability that the soldier died from the effects of the wound, which resulted in pulmonary disease, and this conclusion is perfectly consistent with the facts.

"The ball passed in near the spine and on a level with the left shoulder—passed deep. He died of consumption caused by a bullet wound near the apex of the left lung. He had a cough a long time before he died."

Notwithstanding the positive and consistent evidence of all the affiants, based upon professional knowledge and continuous intimacy with the sick man, and without any proof to the contrary, the conclusion of the medical referee is, "Death resulted from consumption, not gunshot wound."

This assumption is so brief and unsatisfactory that the committee are at a loss to understand why the case is thus disposed of in the face of so much undisputed and positive testimony. If it is intended as a merely technical way of disposing of it, because the doctors affirm that he died of consumption, it is at least apparent that this is not a liberal or even a just decision. The bullet penetrated to near the apex of the left lung; inflammation ensued; there was a gradual decline, waste, and decay—a diminution of the vital powers whose functions had been impaired by the bullet, which penetrated deep, passing in near the spine, on a level with the left shoulder, near the apex of the left lung. There is not a doubt in the mind of the committee that this man died from the wound received in the service.

The accompanying bill for the relief of his widow is reported herewith, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ADVERSE REPORT.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the committee to the position of the bill (S. 811) for the relief of Lydia D. Haltz, which passed the committee and the House at last Friday evening's session by mistake, the bill having been reported adversely by the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Having ascertained this fact, the present occupant of the chair stated it in the House on Saturday, and the action of the House on Friday evening was reconsidered. Now, if there be no objection, this Senate bill No. 811, having been reported adversely, will be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

COLUMBUS BOSTEDER.

The next bill on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration by Mr. RYAN, was the bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder.

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 place on the pension-rolls, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, the name of Columbus Bosteder, late a private in Company B, First Regiment of Missouri Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder, submit the following report:

In March, 1876, claimant filed an application for pension, alleging that "while engaged in building breastworks at Atlanta, Ga., he strained his back, and suffers from same, which also resulted in varicocele." This application was rejected on the ground of no record and inability to furnish satisfactory evidence.

Claimant enlisted in Russell's regiment of Missouri Engineers, and served from October 31, 1861, until July 22, 1865. The regimental hospital records are not on file at the War Department. The company books show that he was absent, sick, at Nashville hospital February, 1864.

Dr. William A. Neal, the assistant surgeon of the regiment, states that he was well acquainted with the claimant, and that at the time of his enlistment he was in good health and particularly free from varicocele and lameness of the back; that while the claimant was in line of duty on or about October 15, 1864, at Atlanta, Ga., while engaged in lifting sand-bags for the fortifications (according to the claimant's and his comrades' statements, who saw him at work, to the affiant), the claimant contracted a varicocele and strain of the back; that he, as the assistant surgeon, saw the claimant shortly after the injury and treated him for varicocele and strain; that about the 20th of November, 1864, on the march, near Hillsborough, Ga., the claimant reported to him for difficulty in marching, from lameness in back and varicocele, and was by him admitted to ambulance; that the claimant also came to him in Washington, D. C., in June, 1865, in regard to his lameness, when affiant again examined him, finding lameness and varicocele still existing. This was shortly before his discharge.

Capt. Thomas W. Bailey, of his company, testifies to incurrence of the disability from personal knowledge.

Dr. Seth Byram testifies to treatment after discharge, and that claimant could not do half a day's work.

Dr. Ralph B. Crawford testifies to treatment in 1870, and subsequent; says he found claimant suffering from varicocele, hydrocele, and spinal weakness, causing great debility.

Enoch Hunter, a neighbor, testifies to an acquaintance from 1870, and says claimant was suffering from a rupture that prevented his performing manual labor.

The examining surgeon at Ponca, Nebr., says, July 18, 1883:

"I find that left testicle is enlarged to about 3 inches in length and nearly 2 inches in width; is very painful on pressure. * * * Can not walk much on account of the dragging pain suffered."

The medical boards, at two subsequent examinations, describe the disability fully and recommend a three-fourths rating. The claimant in his affidavit, and also in his examination before the special examiner, states that he did not notice any swelling until 1869, though there was a constant soreness and pain in the affected parts. Great stress has been laid upon this statement in the Pension Office, and the presumption was raised that the disability might have been subsequently incurred. On the other hand, it is clearly shown by witnesses, who are reputed worthy of credit, that a disability was incurred at the time, place, and in the manner claimed; that he was treated for same shortly after and twice subsequently in the service; that he is now permanently disabled, and has been for nearly twenty years.

To grant him the benefits of this bill seems to your committee but tardy justice, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CORDELIA R. JONES.

The next business on the private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SPOONER) was the bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cordelia R. Jones, widow of Theodore Jones, a private in Company G, Twenty-eighth Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones, submit the following report:

The report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate is a full statement of the case, and is adopted by your committee with a recommendation that the bill pass.

[Senate Report No. 20, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Cordelia R. Jones, praying for a pension, have examined the same, and report:

The claimant's husband, Theodore Jones, enlisted as a private in Company G, Twenty-eighth Illinois Volunteers, March 8, 1865, and was discharged March 8, 1866, by reason of the expiration of the term of his enlistment.

The claim is that he contracted a catarrhal disease in Camp Butler in March, 1865, and died of the effects March 29, 1876. He has no hospital record. Oliver P. Cromwell, first sergeant of his company, deposes that Jones was sick in Camp Butler with a severe cold and complained of his head hurting him from then until Cromwell left the company, about August 1, 1865.

Cromwell was called on by the Department for further information, and made the same statement, adding that Jones went to the doctor quite often.

B. F. Kerick corroborates the above, adding that Jones was frequently exempt from guard duty on account of disability, and was more or less afflicted during his whole term of service. Called on for information under his own hand, Kerick informed the Department, August 16, 1886, that Jones contracted catarrh in Camp Butler between the 8th and 31st of March, 1865, by exposure to cold in open barracks, which settled in his head, gathered and broke, and would appear again after taking a slight cold. Was favored by captain by exemption from guard duty. Was affected by his ailment after his return home, and whenever deponent met him afterwards, would say he was all well except the catarrh in the head. He was no shirk, but was a good soldier.

Adam R. Mulholland corroborates this testimony.

Dr. A. T. Tustison deposes, February 16, 1884, that he first knew Jones in August, 1868, and first treated him in December, 1868; again in March, 1869, and thence up to the time of his death, for nasal catarrh. Treated him during his last sickness. Direct cause of death was congestion of the lungs. Jones was disabled by the disease more or less during the time deponent knew him. Called on by the Department for a more circumstantial history, Dr. Tustison writes that it is a recognized fact that in the majority of catarrhal diseases of long standing the lungs become diseased out of sympathy, especially if there be any tubercular or scrofulous taint, which was the case in the Jones family.

Jones had an irritable cough, which gradually grew upon him the last four or five years of his life. In a subsequent affidavit, April 5, 1887, Dr. Tustison testifies that Jones had a chronic catarrh of the head and throat and an irritable cough, which grew upon him.

It appears satisfactorily that claimant can not ascertain the address or whereabouts of either of the surgeons of the regiment, or any of the officers of the company; that the family physician, Dr. Cutler, who treated him after his discharge, is dead, and that deponent Tustison was the second physician who treated him.

This claim was rejected March 26, 1887, in accordance with the opinion of the medical referee "showing that the fatal disease can not be accepted as a result of nasal catarrh." Claimant appealed, but the rejection was affirmed by the Secretary, on the ground that the issue is a "pathological question, which, having been determined adversely by the medical referee, the Department is constrained to adopt the same conclusion."

After a careful consideration of the evidence in this case, your committee are of the opinion that, notwithstanding the technical objections of the Department, the widow of this soldier is entitled to a pension on account of the death of her husband.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was not agreed to.

SAMUEL E. WYMAN.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration (by Mr. SPOONER) was the bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman.

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 place the name of Samuel E. Wyman, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry Volunteers, on the pension-roll, subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Samuel E. Wyman served in Company G, Fifth Massachusetts Volunteers, from September 10, 1862, to July 2, 1863, when discharged. He again enlisted in the same command July 14, 1864, and served until November 16, 1864, the expiration of his term of service. He applied for pension November 8, 1879, on account of rheumatism, contracted about December, 1862, at New Berne, N. C.

The claim has been rejected upon the ground that there is no record of the alleged disability or evidence of treatment therefor in the service or prior to 1867. This action was had after special examination. The report of the special examiner covers 269 pages, and for the purposes of this report it is deemed sufficient to embody only the summing up of the case by the special examiner, which is as follows:

"The general feeling is that claimant is an honest man, and that he would not ask for a pension unless he believed himself honestly entitled thereto. I am told that he was rather seclusive in the service and not as sociable as a good many others. He is proud, and on account of his deformed condition stays at home and does not show himself as much as he might. It is therefore not at all singular that so many of his comrades have forgotten about him since the war.

"Twenty-four comrades testify that they do not recollect of claimant being lame, or of his complaining about rheumatism or any other disability in the service. Seven comrades testify that they do remember of his being lame and off duty and complaining of rheumatism. I believe the case must be settled by the positive evidence (referring to the several depositions) from comrades, and in depositions (twenty-four in number) as to condition since discharge, and from all the facts in the case I believe the claim to be meritorious."

Medical examination shows back is bent forward so that he looks like a man with a large lump on his back, and the spine is not flexible; right ankle and left knee enlarged and inflamed; is pale and delicate, and has rheumatic iritis of both eyes. Is bent over to such a degree that the abdomen and thorax come so near to each other that the ear of the surgeon can not be placed over the heart. Heart's sounds rapid, feeble, and muffled; slight murmur with second sound. Disability total second grade.

Your committee have carefully examined the evidence in the case, and can not but concur in the opinion of the special examiner, who made such a thorough investigation of the case, that the claim is meritorious, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

THOMAS M'GUIRE.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. LONG) was the bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire.

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 place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions

and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas McGuire, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Thomas McGuire enlisted in Company I, Ninth Massachusetts Volunteers, August 2, 1862, and was discharged June 21, 1864. He alleges that by reason of exposure during the campaign in the Wilderness he contracted disease of left leg, resulting in varicose veins and partial paralysis. The claim has been rejected by the Pension Bureau because there is no record of the alleged disability, and the evidence, including that obtained by special examination, is not deemed sufficient to connect it with the service.

A careful perusal of the testimony establishes beyond a doubt that claimant was healthy and sound at enlistment; that, as a matter of fact, after the crossing of the Rapidan he became lame from some cause; that his lameness increased, and although able to resume his old occupation (that of puddler's helper) after discharge, was soon compelled to seek lighter labor. Probably within a year after discharge he was treated for this leg trouble for a period of five months at the Massachusetts General Hospital, while the postmaster at Weymouth, Mass., testifies that shortly after his return from service, the exact time not now remembered, soldier did receive town aid because of this disability, affiant then being one of the overseers of the town.

The absence of record evidence, as well as of the testimony of commissioned officers and surgeon, would seem to be satisfactorily accounted for by the fact that the disability was contracted but a short time before the muster-out of the command, and had not at that time become so serious in character as to be easily remembered after a lapse of more than twenty years.

The claimant, as well as all the principal witnesses in the case, are shown by the special examiner to be credible, and, while there is not that mass of evidence in the case usually found in pension claims, your committee are convinced of its sufficiency as to origin in the service.

The disability has continued, and is described by the examining surgeons as partial paralysis and varicose ulcers of left leg. Claimant has not been able to do any work since 1886. He is without resources, and now aided by the town in which he lives.

Believing the claim meritorious, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. ADELINE COUZINS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 2356 in order that it may go over until May 28, to be considered with other bills set for consideration on that day. It is a bill granting a pension of \$50 a month to Mrs. Adeline Couzins, and I ask that it go over until May 28, subject to the same conditions as the other bills of like character that are then to come up for consideration.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the bill be read.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I do not ask that the bill be considered now. I do not wish to delay the business of the evening. I merely ask that the bill go over until the 28th.

Several MEMBERS. Let it be read.

The bill was read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] asks unanimous consent that this bill go over until the 28th instant, subject to the conditions agreed upon as to several other bills of like character which are to be considered on that day. Is there objection?

Mr. CHEADLE. Let us have the report read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands that the bill is not called up for consideration now.

Mr. CHEADLE. Yes; but I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. MACDONALD. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CHEADLE. I will withdraw the call for the reading of the report provided it is printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] with that understanding?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not understand the effect of the proposition, Mr. Chairman. Is the previous question to be ordered on the bill? I object to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I call for the regular order. I object to any more time being taken up in this way.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] can state in three minutes what the report contains.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am confident that the gentleman will not object. It is a case—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. For the present objection is made, Mr. Chairman. I do not understand the effect of the proposition.

MARY A. WEST.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. GALLINGER) was the bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary A. West, widow of Edward West, late corporal of Company E, First Regiment Heavy Artillery New Hampshire Volunteers, pension claim numbered 321,490.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West, having considered the same, report as follows:

Edward West was a corporal in Company E, First Regiment New Hamp-

shire Heavy Artillery, and was pensioned for varicose veins. This disability increased in severity until the soldier became greatly broken in health, the blood being impoverished and the brain suffering as a consequence. Finally he died from an embolism (blood clot) at the base of the brain. Claimant applied for pension, as widow of soldier, but it was rejected on the ground that it was not absolutely certain that death resulted from the disease for which soldier was pensioned.

Laying aside all technicalities, there seems to be no good reason for the rejection of this claim. Soldier was attended at different times during the last years of his life by four reputable physicians, and they severally testify that death was the result of the disease contracted in the Army.

Dr. N. W. Bean, of Chichester, N. H., says:

"It is my opinion, from my knowledge of the case derived from attendance on soldier, that the obstruction to the circulation, caused by the varicose condition of the leg, was the inciting cause of all the symptoms attending his death."

Dr. B. S. Warren, of Concord, N. H., a medical examiner for the Government during the war, testifies as follows:

"I believe that the disease of the brain was caused by minute embolia, derived from disintegrated clots formed in the dilated sacs of the varicose veins of the lower limbs."

Dr. N. T. Clark, of London, N. H., and Dr. James C. How, of Haverhill, Mass., both testify unqualifiedly to the same facts, the latter physician saying:

"I frequently saw him. He was suffering from large varicose veins of the right leg, with enfeebled action of the heart and dyspeptic trouble. I have no doubt that the disease from which soldier died was caused by and was to be expected from the condition of the veins."

This case was approved for admission, but, as above stated, was rejected by the medical reviewer on the ground that it had not been medically established. Inasmuch as four reputable physicians, who attended the soldier and knew all about his condition, swear positively that he did die from disease contracted in the Army, and for which he was pensioned, your committee regard the claim as one of exceptional merit, and therefore recommend its passage with an amendment striking out all after the word "volunteers," in the eighth line.

The amendment recommended by the committee was adopted.

There being no objection, the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EDNA M. HILDRETH.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. GROUT) was the bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to put on the pension-roll, at the rate of \$25 per month, the name of Edna M. Hildreth, of Jay, Vt., the helpless invalid daughter of William H. Hildreth, who was a member of Company D of the Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, and who died from wounds received in battle.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

Claimant is the helpless invalid daughter of William H. Hildreth, late a private in Company D, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, who was severely wounded at the battle of Fredericksburgh, and died in Harwood Hospital, in the city of Washington. There is abundant evidence before the committee, medical and otherwise, to show that claimant is utterly unable, in consequence of an incurable disease, which has afflicted her all through life, to do anything for her own support, and that she has no relatives who are able to care for her.

For many years she has been supported by a step-father, but what little property he had was recently destroyed by fire, and now this daughter of a soldier who gave his life for his country must either receive aid from the Government or become a pauper, to be supported at public expense. This case is directly in the line of numerous precedents, several of which have been passed at the present session of Congress, the rate of pension being placed at \$18 per month.

Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "twenty-five," in the fourth line, and also by striking out all after the word "Hildreth," in the sixth line, and inserting the words "a private in Company D, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers," and with these amendments recommend its passage.

The amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. ADELINE COUZINS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who objected to the order requested by me with reference to Senate bill No. 2356, to provide a pension to Mrs. Adeline Couzins, have consented to withdraw the objection. I renew the request for unanimous consent that this bill go over with the others of the same class until May 28, the previous question being considered as ordered, but the bill to be open to amendment at that time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will state that upon the explanation made to me by the gentleman from Missouri I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BYNUM. The only question is whether, if the previous question be ordered, there will be any right to offer amendments when the bill comes up.

The CHAIRMAN. That right will exist, if it be now reserved.

Mr. BYNUM. If that can be done, I have no objection to the previous question being ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, this bill will go over till May 28 with the understanding that the previous question is ordered, but that the bill shall be open to amendment. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ABIAL S. CHAMBERLAIN.

The next business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. LONG) was the bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial S. Chamberlain.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions of the pension laws, the name of Abial S. Chamberlain, late Company K, First Massachusetts Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

Chamberlain was mustered as captain of Company K, First Massachusetts

Volunteers, May 24, 1861; promoted to lieutenant-colonel and transferred to the Third Regiment North Carolina Colored Volunteers November 10, 1863. He was mustered out of service June 16, 1865. On June 25, 1862, in battle at Fair Oaks, he was severely wounded in mouth and jaw, for which he is now in receipt of a pension at the rate of \$20 per month. He filed an application for increase on account of paralysis resulting from the wound, which application has been denied by the Pension Office, the medical referee holding that the paralysis is not chargeable to the wound.

The certificate of the surgeon, who examined the pensioner at his home on September 29, 1887, he being unable to leave his room, is as follows:

"I find a scar on the right side of lower lip, extending to jaw, also on the end of tongue. The scar on lip about an inch long, not adherent. Another cicatrix about an inch below the angle of lower jaw, which is adherent to the bone, with an indentation in bone about one-quarter inch in depth and one-half inch in width, not tender to pressure. His walk is feeble and staggering. His intellect is dull, appears bewildered when questioned. The power of motion of left arm and leg is greatly impaired, so as to require help in dressing. He has only partial control of his bladder; his urine runs away, keeping his clothing wet. I think the paralysis is due to cerebral lesion, caused probably by injury of branches of the trifacial nerve, lying in the track of the ball. He is, in my opinion, entitled to total rating for the disability caused by wound of mouth and jaw, and for that caused from resulting paralysis first grade, requiring aid of another person."

Dr. A. Elliot, late assistant surgeon One hundred and fourth United States Colored Troops, under date of February 28, 1888, testifies that claimant is unable to be about his room only as he is assisted. He requires the assistance of some one all the time, he not even being able to attend the calls of nature without being assisted.

Claimant's hearing and eye-sight are likewise impaired by the wound.

The effect of a wound upon the nervous system is at times extraordinary in character, as is well illustrated in cases of lockjaw, following often upon the slightest injury. In this case there is a serious wound, which, in the opinion of the examining surgeon, acting under the special instruction of the Pension Bureau, after a thorough examination of the case, affected the branches of the trifacial nerve. If this is true, and your committee have no reason to doubt the correctness of the surgeon's opinion, the connection of the paralysis with the wound seems to be established. At any rate no other cause for this deplorable condition appears in the case.

Therefore, believing that some relief should be granted this great sufferer, your committee return the accompanying bill, with the recommendation that it do pass, amended, however, by inserting therein after the word "Volunteers," in last line, the following words: "And pay him a pension at the rate of \$45 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him."

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

And pay him a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of the pension now received by him.

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$45" and inserting "\$72." This report shows that the applicant is totally disabled; and the rate under the law for a pensioner totally disabled is \$72 per month. It appears from the report that the applicant's wife has been obliged to attend him continuously for the last six months. If in any case ever presented the applicant was entitled to \$72 under the law, this is such a case. I trust the amendment will be adopted without division.

Mr. MORRILL. The law allows only \$50 in a case of this kind, where the pensioner requires the constant assistance of another person.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then make it \$50.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to inquire whether the facts which would entitle this applicant under the practice of the Pension Office to a pension of \$50 a month are made to appear in the report?

Mr. MORRILL. The Pension Office rejected this claim on the ground that the paralysis was not proved to have been the result of the wound. If that fact had been established to the satisfaction of the office \$50 a month would have been allowed. In such cases the rule of the committee has been to fix the rate just below \$50—at \$45, as in this case.

Mr. CHEADLE. If there is any objection to my amendment, I withdraw it.

The amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. I move to amend the title and body of the bill by correcting the name, which should be "Abial G. Chamberlain," instead of "Abial S. Chamberlain."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] will be agreed to.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. SAWYER. Before that is done, I hope the gentleman from Michigan will allow the next bill on the Calendar to be considered. It is one introduced by myself, and I expect to be absent for the next two weeks.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I have no objection. I withdraw my motion for the present.

NETTIE ELLICOTT.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. SAWYER) was the bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott.

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 place upon the pension-roll of the United States, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nettie Ellicott, widow of George E. Ellicott, late a private in the Seventeenth New York Independent Battery.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The beneficiary named in this bill is the widow of George G. Ellicott, who was mustered in the United States service, August 26, 1862, as a private in the Seventeenth New York Independent Battery, and was discharged June 12, 1865. The soldier died May 17, 1864, leaving surviving him the beneficiary, his widow. The soldier at the time of his death was receiving a pension for chronic diarrhea, the

rate being increased from July, 1881. He had been drawing a pension for this disability from June, 1865. The good character of the soldier fully appears.

The physicians who attended the soldier during his last sickness state in their affidavit that he died from chronic diarrhea and erysipelas. The widow applied for a pension, and the same was rejected on the ground that the erysipelas was not a result of chronic diarrhea and not otherwise traced to the service.

There was no dispute that chronic diarrhea continued down to soldier's death, and pension paid to that time. The evidence as to cause of soldier's death, aside from the evidence of the widow and non-professional witnesses, consists of the report of examining surgeons, the opinion of the examining officer in the Pension Office, and the affidavits of Drs. Munson, Warren, and Chamberlain, physicians living near the soldier, and who knew him and treated him the last years of his life. The personal character and professional standing of these gentlemen is fully indorsed.

The certificate of the surgeon general shows that the soldier was treated in hospital in 1864 and 1865, while in service, for this disease, and the evidence shows the soldier was sick with the same disease at time of his discharge. The reports of the examining surgeons, made in 1878 and 1881, show the continuance and existence of this disease at those periods, and the evidence on file shows that the disease continued down to the time of his death.

Dr. Chamberlain states in his affidavit that he treated the soldier "in the month of November, 1881, for a severe attack of chronic diarrhea, which continued for a week or ten days. The diarrhea was of a very bad, chronic form, and much pus and blood passed with the feces. There prevailed a low general tone and lack of vitality evidenced by palor, flabbiness, lassitude, and general debility."

"I afterwards saw him in each year to his death, observed his condition, and talked with him frequently. I saw his growing weakness and debility, and the advancing effects of his said diarrhea until he finally died in the spring of 1884. From my personal knowledge of his case, I have no doubt that the chronic diarrhea was the primary and leading cause of his death, as it was my opinion when treating him, as above stated, that he could not long survive the said chronic diarrhea."

Dr. Munson states in his affidavit:

"I attended said Ellicott from the 6th day of May, 1884, until the 16th day of May, 1884. That said Ellicott was suffering from chronic diarrhea and erysipelas, the latter developing a phlegmonous character as it proceeded, the former accompanying it through all its stages. That in my opinion said diarrhea was an aggravation of a chronic diarrhea which had existed since said Ellicott left the Army, and that said diarrhea both predisposed him to the erysipelas from which he suffered, and was the prominent factor in the case which precluded a favorable issue."

Dr. Warren, in his affidavit, states:

"On or about the 15th day of May, 1884, I was called in consultation with Dr. Edward Munson to see said Ellicott. I found him suffering from phlegmonous erysipelas of the face and head, which I was informed by the attending physician had commenced as an ordinary form of erysipelas about one week previous. The following symptoms had obtained when I saw him: Pulse 130, temperature 104; low muttering delirium; face swollen and edematous; fetid; skin of face, forehead, and ears puffy, dark, and almost purple, extending to neck, where a natural color prevailed."

"I found in the history of the case that he was a pensioner from chronic diarrhea, and that the diarrhea which prevailed at that time and during his sickness was, in our opinion, an aggravation of his chronic disease. It was consequently my opinion that the low condition of his system, which predisposed him to the erysipelas and prevented him from successfully passing through the attack, was due to and directly consequent upon this same chronic diarrhea."

The same physician, in a subsequent affidavit, says, upon reconsidering his affidavit:

"I wish it to be understood that the primary and active cause of the said soldier's death was chronic diarrhea, which had so vitiated his system and reduced his general vitality as to render him liable to complication of diseases, or the supervening of secondary causes, such as erysipelas or ulcerations in various parts of the body, which might hasten, and in this case undoubtedly did, the final fatal result."

"I should say that the erysipelas which supervened upon the chronic diarrhea in this case was only an incidental contributing cause of death, whereas the chronic diarrhea was the original and primary cause of the sickness and death of the said soldier."

The medical examiners in the Pension Office had the affidavits presented to them, and while the committee would not desire to criticize in the least their action, they feel that the clearly stated opinions of these physicians of high standing in their profession, who personally knew the soldier, examined his case, and saw his condition, and who had better opportunity of forming a correct conclusion, are entitled to acceptance, and they therefore recommend that this bill to place the name of this widow, who is shown to be a worthy and poor woman, upon the pension-roll, do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the Private Calendar, had directed him to report sundry bills with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

House bills of the following titles, reported without amendments, were severally ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

- A bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor;
- A bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren;
- A bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
- A bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman;
- A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire; and
- A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott.

Amendments reported to House bills of the following titles were severally agreed to, and the bills as amended were ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

- A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase;
- A bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West;
- A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth; and
- A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported without amendment, were severally ordered to a third reading, and they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

- A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;
- A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;
- A bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;
- A bill (S. 636) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee;
- A bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;
- A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey;
- A bill (S. 1293) granting a pension to Mary Gammell; and
- A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones.

The amendment reported to the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.

The bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Lydia D. Holtz was indefinitely postponed in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

BILLS UNDISPOSED OF.

Bills of the following titles, in accordance with the recommendation of the committee, were postponed to May 28, the previous question ordered thereon, and thirty minutes allowed for debate:

A bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan;

A bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. Walker;

A bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander; and

A bill (S. 2356) to provide a pension for Mrs. Adeline Couzins.

Mr. MORRILL moved to reconsider the votes just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARY ANN LANG.

On motion of Mr. CHIPMAN, the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang.

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 place the name of Mary Ann Lang, widow of Peter Lang, late private Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, on the pension-roll, at the rate prescribed by existing provisions of law.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Mary Ann Lang is the widow of Peter Lang, who enlisted in Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, December 21, 1863, and was mustered out July 8, 1865. He died February 21, 1881, of dropsy. At the battle of Mechanicsville, Va., June 1, 1864, he received a wound of nose, on account of which he was a pensioner at time of his death. A week previous to his death he applied for increase of pension on account of rheumatism, but this application was not filed until February 26, 1881.

The widow's claim has been rejected, and the rejection affirmed by the Secretary of the Interior, on the ground that the soldier's death (cause, dropsy) was, in the opinion of the medical referee, due to the excessive use of alcoholic liquors. This decision appears to have been based upon the report of a special examiner. It appears therefrom that soldier, at time of his death and for some years prior thereto, kept a beer saloon in the city of Detroit; but it is not shown, excepting by the testimony of one person, that in the pursuit of this business he drank to excess or that he ever was under the influence of liquor, while on the other hand it is clearly shown that he used beer moderately and at his place of business only.

This witness is one Dr. Hoyt, who attended the soldier at different times probably after 1873, and who treated him in his last illness. He testifies that he first treated soldier for rheumatism affecting arms and legs severely, which, as he then understood, was of long standing. This rheumatism kept up, and he had attacks lasting four or five weeks up to about a year and a half before he died. Then he had a liver trouble, which was of a cirrhosis character, that resulted in dropsy, which caused his death. Thinks there was also heart trouble, but does not think that there was any disease of kidneys. Affiant was unable to connect the rheumatism with the liver trouble and could not give any other reason for it except his (soldier's) long use of beer and liquor.

Dr. Julius Richter testifies to an acquaintance with the soldier since 1867, and that he treated him from that time until 1871 for chronic rheumatism. Again treated him at intervals from 1873 to death. There was no enlargement of the liver, but there was atrophy of the heart. Some three years before death dropsy appeared. Was in attendance upon the soldier three or four hours before his death. Does not believe that soldier's daily drinking had any connection with his fatal disease.

A number of comrades testify, and their testimony is uncontroverted, that soldier did contract rheumatism and suffered therefrom at the time he was wounded, as before stated. Neighbors testify that when home on furlough, after the receipt of the wound, he used liniments for rheumatism of legs. At date of final discharge he is again shown to have suffered from the same disease, and its continuance thereafter is clearly established.

There was no *post-mortem* examination. The soldier's occupation would seem to have so prejudiced the claim of the widow that no effort whatever was made by the Pension Office to examine the comrades and others who have testified in the case.

It is a well-established medical fact that rheumatism of long duration will produce disease of heart, and that dropsy is a common sequel of the latter disease.

That soldier did contract rheumatism in the service, and that he was a constant sufferer therefrom ever after, is shown beyond a doubt. It is likewise shown that his heart became seriously affected therefrom. Why should the widow now be deprived of a pension because one physician attributes dropsy to the use of beer, when another, who was more intimately acquainted with the soldier and his habits, connects the same with the rheumatism of service?

In the opinion of your committee the widow should have the benefit of the doubt, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

EMILY M'CLURE.

On motion of Mr. BAKER, of New York, the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure.

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 place on the pension-roll the name of Emily McClure, mother of Thomas J. McClure, late first lieutenant, Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Artillery, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to submit the following report:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the mother of Thomas J. McClure, who was killed in the battle of Cold Harbor, June 3, 1864, while serving as first lieutenant of Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Artillery. He left surviving him a widow, but no minor child, who was pensioned and died after remarriage.

Prior to his enlistment as well as during his service the soldier contributed to the support of his widowed mother, who was not, and is not now, possessed of any property affording her an income, but has since the death of her husband in 1867 been dependent upon her own labor and the contributions of others. Of these facts there is ample evidence before the committee. She is now seventy-one years of age and unable longer to gain a subsistence through her own efforts.

The fact that the soldier left surviving him a widow deprives the mother of a pension under the general pension law. But Congress having in many instances granted relief to the poor and aged parents of deceased soldiers who are not otherwise provided for, your committee are of opinion that the relief asked for in this case should likewise be granted, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, the House, pursuant to order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. DUNHAM: A bill (H. R. 10030) for the relief of Dearborn Foundry Company, of Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 10031) for the relief of Joseph L. Walls—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10032) granting a pension to Milton Wallen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10033) granting a pension to Charlotte Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGAN: A bill (H. R. 10034) in relation to the claim of William H. H. Brooks against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 10035) for the relief of J. M. Blacklock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 10036) for the relief of Reddick Aycock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 10037) granting a pension to Aaron Shurtleff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 10038) for the relief of Joseph C. Black—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10039) for the relief of George W. Claypool, administrator of Reuben Claypool—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10040) for the relief of A. D. Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of Robert D. Sears, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARUTH: Petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., in favor of the bill to prevent convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mrs. Susan C. Ashcroft for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Vermont, in favor of an appropriation for headstones for departed comrades—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of General Daniel Butterfield, for the restoration of Fort Putnam as provided for by House bill No. 9210—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of the employes of the Pioneer Flax Mills, of New Brighton, Pa., against the reduction of duties on goods manufactured from flax and hemp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition of John J. Trice, of Anna L. Boxley, widow of Joseph C. Boxley, and of Mattie D. Trice, heir of Silas Boxley, of Louisa County, Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: Petition of Excelsior Assembly, No. 325, Knights of Labor, against convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., for an appropriation for certain improvements at Fort Snelling, Minn.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Petition of Johanna Merckle, of East Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, and of Alphonse H. Amand, of Point Coupee Parish, Louisiana, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Petition of C. M. Meriwether and others, heirs of David Meriwether, of Jasper County, and of J. B. Ozburn, heir of John M. Ozburn, of Clayton County, and of Reddick Aycock, of Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of J. S. Staleup and others, regarding convict-made goods—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of heirs of Sarah Hayes, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WISE: Petition of E. W. Gates, executor of Hiram W. Tyler, of Henrico County, Virginia, for reference of his 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. BUNNELL: Of druggists and physicians of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. CANDLER: Of citizens of Georgia.

By Mr. HARMER: Of citizens of Pennsylvania.

The following petition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. MACDONALD: Of citizens of Beaver Falls, Minn.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: Of citizens of Plymouth, Conn.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Of 135 citizens of Washington and St. Clair Counties, Illinois.

By Mr. McKENNA: Of 76 citizens of Alameda County, California.

By Mr. TRACEY (by request): Of 75 citizens of Albany, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 19, 1888.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Speaker's table be permitted to remain there until next Monday's session. There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey;

A bill (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lambertton, in the district of Burlington, New Jersey, to the port of Trenton, in said district;

A bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William P. Thorne;

A bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Henry Brock; and

A 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to.