

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Coke,	Hoar,	Sherman,
Allison,	Dixon,	Ingalls,	Spooner,
Bate,	Dolph,	Moody,	Teller,
Berry,	Frye,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Blair,	George,	Pettigrew,	Vest,
Call,	Gorman,	Platt,	Walthall,
Casey,	Gray,	Ransom,	Washburn,
Chandler,	Hampton,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa.
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Sawyer,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Thirty-five Senators have answered to their names—less than a quorum.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 9, 1890, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 8, 1890.

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.

ALBERT H. EMERY.

Mr. BURROWS. I rise to a privileged motion. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to the Senate amendment and agreed to the conference on the bill (H. R. 2538) for the relief of Albert H. Emery.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] calls up a privileged motion. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] entered a motion to reconsider in the case of the bill for the relief of Albert H. Emery.

Mr. McMILLIN. What is the proposition?

Mr. BURROWS. Simply to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. McMILLIN. It had better not be done now.

Mr. BURROWS. That is the motion I make, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to call up the matter.

Mr. BURROWS. As gentlemen will remember, this bill passed the House some time ago and came back with a Senate amendment. On motion of the gentleman from Indiana the House disagreed to the Senate amendment and agreed to the conference asked by the Senate. Subsequently on the same day the gentleman moved to reconsider the vote; and that is where the matter rests on the Journal. I now move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Indiana is not now in his seat. I trust the gentleman from Michigan will withhold his motion for the present.

Mr. BURROWS. The motion can be put in his absence just as well. It is not debatable.

Mr. DOCKERY. I suppose the gentleman understands there is no quorum here and that it will require a quorum to pass on his motion.

Mr. BURROWS. Of course, if gentlemen are going to insist on the point of no quorum, it is evident there is no quorum here, and I will withdraw the motion for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his request to take up the matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEM, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed acts and joint resolutions of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 8250) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a high wagon bridge across the Missouri River at or near Sioux City, Iowa," approved March 2, 1889;

An act (H. R. 7156) to provide for the increase of the limit of cost of site and public buildings at Newark, N. J.;

An act (H. R. 164) to increase the limit of cost of the erection of a public building at Wilmington, Del.;

An act (H. R. 533) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fremont, in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 5179) fixing the rate of interest to be charged on arrearages of general and special taxes now due the District of Columbia if paid within a time specified;

An act (H. R. 7509) granting to the Palouse and Spokane Railway a right of way through the Nez Percé Indian reservation in Idaho;

An act (H. R. 5964) granting the Spokane Falls and Northern Railway Company the right of way through the Colville Indian reservation;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 14) authorizing the use and improvement of Castle Island, in Boston Harbor; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 128) construing part of act of March 2, 1889, making appropriation for the office of Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 389) to construct a road to the national cemetery at Port Hudson, La.;

A bill (H. R. 1590) to ratify an act entitled "An act to provide for a wagon-road between Mount Idaho, in Idaho County, and Little Salmon Meadows, in Washington County," in Idaho Territory;

A bill (H. R. 4553) to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver to the State of Colorado the flags carried by Colorado regiments;

A bill (H. R. 5965) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department;

A bill (H. R. 6474) to submit the location of the county seat of Shoshone County, Idaho Territory, to a vote of the people of said county;

A bill (H. R. 7904) for the issue of ordnance stores and supplies to the State of Maine to replace similar stores destroyed by fire; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 105) to continue in force an act authorizing the construction of a bridge over Bayou Bernard, in the State of Mississippi.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence was requested, a bill (H. R. 7166) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to amend the act dividing the State of Missouri into two judicial districts, and for other purposes."

Also, that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill (H. R. 7754) granting right of way to the Little Falls, Mille Lacs and Lake Superior Railroad across the Mille Lacs Indian reservation, asked a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. DAWES, Mr. STOCKBRIDGE, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as conferees on the part of the Senate.

Also, that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1306) for the erection of a public building at Hudson, N. Y., asked a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. SPOONER, Mr. SQUIRE, and Mr. PASCO as conferees on the part of the Senate.

Also, that the Senate agreed to the reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 7175) for the erection of a public building at Tuscaloosa, Ala.;

A bill (H. R. 4652) for a public building at Ashland, Wis.;

A bill (S. 954) authorizing the construction of a public building at Burlington, Iowa;

A bill (S. 903) for the erection of a public building in Cedar Rapids, Iowa;

A bill (S. 606) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at La Fayette, in the State of Indiana; and

A bill (S. 2406) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Atchison, in the State of Kansas.

Also, that the Senate receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate "to print the report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1888" and agreed to the same.

The message further announced that the Senate requested the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2598) increasing the pension of Walker P. Harrison.

Also, that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 243) for the relief of Frank Della Terre and Susan F. Della Terre, heirs of Peter Della Terre, deceased;

A bill (S. 249) providing for the completion of the public building in the city of Pensacola, Fla., as originally designed;

A bill (S. 298) to increase the accommodations at the marine hospital at Detroit, Mich.;

A bill (S. 405) for the relief of James A. Terrell;

A bill (S. 460) making an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the construction of a light and fog-signal at the mouth of Coquille River, on the Pacific Ocean;

A bill (S. 681) making an appropriation for the benefit of the estate of William Moss, deceased;

A bill (S. 846) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay and the executors of Donald McKay;

A bill (S. 1028) for the relief of William Bushby;

A bill (S. 1258) for the relief of Charles Murphy;

A bill (S. 1395) to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1456) correcting the military history of David A. Parkhurst;

A bill (S. 1512) to erect a public building at Lima, Ohio;

A bill (S. 1762) to change the boundaries of the Uncompahgre reservation;

A bill (S. 1988) to establish a hospital and home for inebriates and dipsomaniacs in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2200) for the relief of Mary E. Johnson;

A bill (S. 2695) in relation to a farm for the Indian training school at Pierre, S. Dak.;

A bill (S. 2741) providing for sundry light-houses and other aids to navigation on the Great Lakes;

A bill (S. 2845) to establish a public park at Pagosa Springs, in the State of Colorado;

A bill (S. 2960) to authorize the building of a bridge at Pine Bluff, Ark., across the Arkansas River;

A bill (S. 3040) to establish a public park to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park;

A bill (S. 3050) to provide for the purchase of a site for a military post near Eagle Pass, Tex., and for the construction of suitable buildings thereon;

A bill (S. 3115) to punish the unlawful appropriation of the use of the property of another in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3127) amending an act entitled "An act to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled 'An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes,' to said port of Lincoln;";

A bill (S. 3174) constituting Cairo, Ill., a port of delivery in the customs-collection district of New Orleans;

A bill (S. 3190) to establish additional life-saving stations;

A bill (S. 3191) for the relief of Albert Shell;

A bill (S. 3192) for the relief of John R. Blankenship;

A bill (S. 3198) granting a pension to G. L. Pease;

A bill (S. 3545) to extend and amend "An act to authorize the Fort Worth and Denver City Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;"; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 62) authorizing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of three engineers to examine and report on a national harbor of refuge near the mouth of Delaware Bay suitable for deep-draught vessels.

It also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9548) providing for the classification of worsted cloths as woolens.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, was also received announcing that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 809) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.

The message also announced that, in accordance with the request of the House, the Senate returned the bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of Barent S. Van Buren.

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1221) granting a pension to Helen Plunkett, asked a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. FAULKNER as conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. HILL. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the bill (H. R. 6291) granting a pension to Delia T. S. Parnell was put over from yesterday until this morning. I think it will delay the House but a moment to dispose of that bill now.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I suggest that the gentleman had better defer the request for the present. We should probably make no progress now in any matter requiring a division.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. LEHLBACH, until Wednesday, the 12th instant, on account of important business.

To Mr. DE LANO, indefinitely, on account of important business.

TARIFF BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 9416.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. PAYSON in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, the exercise of the functions of government involves the expenditure of money. Any system of taxation which may be devised to provide the necessary revenue should illustrate the principles of perfect equality. The burdens of taxation have always been willingly assumed by the people when restricted to legitimate public purposes, but history makes no record of an instance of their willingness to be hampered with exactions intended to subvert private interests. A tax so unjustly imposed may be disguised for a long time, but the device will always be discovered in the end. It has proven so with respect to the existing system of taxation, and the gath-

ering protest of the people will soon enforce its recognition in the re-establishment of that policy which tried by the test of actual results vindicated alike its justice to all interests and to all citizens of the Republic.

The Government of the United States collected for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, \$223,832,741.69 under the existing tariff, an average annual tax, estimating our population at 65,000,000, of \$3.44 per capita, an amount more than \$121,000,000 in excess of the sum collected in any one of the four years of the civil war. This enormous drain upon the resources of the country was not levied upon the basis of wealth, as is the rule in respect to local taxation, but was imposed upon foreign goods sold in the American market, and is therefore in its ultimate result necessarily a tax upon those who consume these imported goods.

It being thus a tax upon the necessities of the people rather than upon their wealth, it would seem to be the part of wise statesmanship to lay its heaviest emphasis upon the luxuries, which are consumed by the wealthier classes, and so to adjust the scheme as to meet only the demands of the Government administered upon a basis of judicious economy. Under the present system the tariff taxes are heaviest upon the prime necessities of life and are greatly in excess of the amount required to discharge all the varied functions and obligations of the Government.

SURPLUS AND BONDS.

From the 3d of August, 1887, to the 3d of May, 1890, inclusive, a period of exactly two years and nine months, these unnecessary taxes upon the consumers of the country have aggregated \$374,287,819.01 of surplus in the public Treasury; so that to anticipate the resultant congestion, and hence avert a financial crisis, the Secretary of the Treasury has been compelled to purchase \$271,209,400 of Government bonds not due until 1891 and 1907.

The enforced and premature retirement of these bonds has involved the loss to the people of \$46,600,527.44 as premiums.

That a proper conception may be had of such wanton prodigality, the fruit of this enormous and unnecessary burden upon the business enterprises of the country, it may be stated that the aggregate amount of premiums paid in excess of the face value of the bonds is the equivalent of more than one-twentieth of the entire assessed value of all the property of Missouri, and in excess of the taxable value of all the real and personal property of the ten counties which constitute the district I have the honor of representing upon this floor.

Mr. Chairman, I thus briefly referred to the surplus millions of the people's money which have been wantonly diverted from their natural channels, and to the use made of them by the Secretary of the Treasury, that we may discern the great weight of the burden this system thus incidentally imposes. We must not in so doing, however, confound the shadow with the substance, nor mistake the effect for the cause. A redundant or depleted treasury may illustrate, but should never be allowed to confuse, the argument. It would be a gross misapprehension of the respective positions of the two great political parties to revolve this argument around the mere question of a surplus.

The surplus might be reduced or canceled in many ways; as, for instance, by extravagant appropriations or by the abolition of the whisky tax, and yet would the burdens upon the agricultural and other unprotected industries remain undisturbed. Great as might be the relative advantages of a liberated and affluent circulation, still this issue is subordinate and inferior in vital magnitude and importance to that exigent and clamorous one of enlarging the markets of agricultural products and unshackling life's daily needs of unnecessary and paralyzing taxation. Here, Mr. Chairman, is the gist of the controversy, and around this issue twines and clusters the entire argument.

I was pleased to hear on yesterday the confession that came from the leader of the Republican side of the House [Mr. MCKINLEY], when he reluctantly conceded the depression which now characterizes the agricultural interests of the country; and yet, Mr. Chairman, when gentlemen on this side in the great tariff debate of 1888 referred to that growing depression, now no longer denied, the statement was controverted by every Republican Representative on this floor under the lead of the eminent gentleman who now presides over this House.

Mr. Chairman, I recall especially the declaration of the present chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. FUNSTON, who ridiculed the statement that the farming interest was burdened and depressed. Denial is no longer possible, for to-day the most plaintive wail from that industry comes from the great State of Kansas, and from her farmers, who during the past winter have been compelled to rely on their surplus corn for fuel. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MISTAKEN FARMERS.

Sir, the time has fully come for a change of this vicious financial policy which is rolling its wheels of Juggernaut across the prostrate body of agriculture in the service of discriminated and fostered classes. The conditions which to-day confront the Western farmer are ominous of evil and somber with the shadows of neglected redress and reform. The farm-mortgage industry is spreading octopus-like all over the Union, and has already embraced within its grasp the fertile acres of the broad West.

President Cleveland, in his ringing message to the Fiftieth Congress, characterized in fitting terms the existing system of tariff taxation, and yet, sir, at every point of attack he was confronted by Republican farmers, who, echoing the assertions of Republican orators and Republican platforms, prophesied of phantom disasters that were to follow hard upon the adoption of a "free-trade policy." The Republican farmers of the West, however, who thus apprehensively voted against Cleveland, low taxes, and freer trade, in advocacy of Harrison, high taxes, and as they thought of enhanced prices and better times, sit to-day, sir, dejectedly amidst the gathering shadows of disappointed expectations. The banners they carried in the last campaign on which was emblazoned the strange and anomalous device, "Protection gives the farmer better prices for his products," are now silently folded away.

Those farmers as they now return from the markets to their homes, mortgaged to Eastern loan companies, are grievously and sorely discomfited because they have realized lower prices for everything they produce, although but a little more than twelve months gone they rejoiced in a great "protection" victory that speciously assured to them all the boasted benefits of a "home market." The prices of every item that goes to make up the agricultural output of a Western farmer are to-day ruling lower than they have for many years past, whilst the discontent and unrest of the farming classes are more pronounced than they have ever been within the period of our national existence.

Mr. MORSE. Just at this point, will the gentleman permit an interrogatory?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think the interstate-commerce law interferes much more with the interchange of commodities and has had more to do with the depression in the price of farm products than the tariff.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, substantially the same condition of affairs, so far as the interstate-commerce law is involved, prevailed prior to its adoption as has prevailed subsequent to it.

In fact, the law has been in operation but a little more than three years. I may say further, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a temporary condition with which we have to deal, for, sir, hailing as you do from the great West, I feel assured that you will confirm the entire accuracy of my statement when I aver that in the entire West farm values have not at any time recovered from the depression consequent upon the panic of 1873, whilst the decline, during the last ten years, has been so marked that we have at last reached a point where values have almost disappeared.

The evidence of this disheartening condition is to-day disclosed on the streets of our Western cities and towns in the public announcements, "Eastern money to loan on improved farms." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

EXISTING CONDITIONS.

In the light, therefore, of existing conditions, which have made farming no longer profitable, and in the conviction that these conditions are in a paramount measure the result of a discriminative system of protective taxation, the Democratic party again proclaims the issue of tariff reform and will never strike its flag until there shall be re-established the perfect equality of all interests under the law.

The farmers of the United States, with slight variation of phrase and slighter variation of fact—I was about to say the mortgaged farmers of the United States—are vastly more interested in a proper revision of the existing schedule of tariff taxation than perhaps any other class of our people, and for these reasons: that whilst the present vicious and inequitable system enhances the prices to them of those things whose demand is constant, indispensable, and relentless, they are at the same time compelled to resort to the markets of the world with their surplus products, handicapped by restrictive trade regulations.

This policy of exclusion has, in the language of the Declaration of Independence, "cut off our trade with all parts of the world," whilst the farmer, its especial victim, is forced by the inexorable logic of the situation into the position of a free-trader as to his surplus products, and compelled to barter his only merchandise in utter disregard of the law of reciprocity.

A policy of taxation, therefore, which will give the farmer all articles of necessity at a lower cost and at the same time permit an exchange of his surplus products for those he needs of other nations, offers to him the best and only guaranty of remunerative prices. For now nearly thirty years, Mr. Chairman, these desirable conditions for the farmer have been annulled by the Republican policy of discrimination and exclusion, surrendering the seas, with all their vast commerce, to England and other nations, diverting the currents of wealth into artificial and arbitrary channels, multiplying paupers among the laboring classes, and impoverishing the farming class, who constitute one-half of our population engaged in productive occupations.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there yet remain some differences among our Western farmers as to the causes which have wrought the steady decline of the agricultural wealth of the nation; but, sir, it is beyond the pale of controversy and denial that a remedy must be speedily devised to check that disintegration and decay in the farming interest which are to-day illustrated in a mortgaged indebtedness swelling to

appalling proportions. Sir, the Western farmers in other days were the heaviest depositors in our banks; at this time they are the largest borrowers.

WHAT IS PROTECTION?

Let us then endeavor, Mr. Chairman, to make an impartial examination of this question and to detect the vice inherent in and properly chargeable to the present protective system; and to accomplish this and so fix the responsibility we must first understand the exact nature and effects of the system. In this investigation let us not forget the fundamental proposition, so often repeated, that a tariff is a tax levied upon foreign goods, or, if you please, a tribute paid on such goods for the privilege of selling them in the American markets; and that when the scope of the taxing power is limited to a provision for the actual necessities of the Government alone it is properly characterized as "a revenue tariff" or tax.

A protective tariff or tax is, however, essentially different both as to its purpose and effect, as will be readily recognized from the reading of the declaration of the last Republican national convention. The Republican position in respect to a protective tariff is stated in the following terms:

The Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes; and by such revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which can not be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes, rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system at the joint behest of the whisky trusts and the agents of foreign manufacturers.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the avowed purpose of a protective tax is to prohibit competition by adjusting the scale of taxation upon foreign goods so high that foreign competition will be excluded from our market, or if the rate be not absolutely prohibitory it is at all events to be fixed sufficiently high to enable protected interests to advance materially the price of their wares and merchandise. Increased profits to protected industries is the logical intent of the Republican position, since the plea that protection protects their labor is only tenable on the assumption that the actual realization of increased prices enables them to advance the wages of their employes.

It will thus be readily discovered that this system inures to the benefit exclusively of those industries so shielded from competition, since the Government is not a beneficiary and can derive no revenue except from foreign goods brought to our market. The analysis of the theory of protection may be briefly resolved, therefore, into the proposition that a high tariff on foreign goods excludes competition in whole or in part and that the absence of competition enables American industries to enhance the price of their products to the amount substantially of the tax; and, although it may be conceded in perfect frankness that this result does not always follow, yet where it fails to do so it is solely because of domestic competition ensuing upon a production and dissemination of the article in question so widespread as to preclude the formation of a combination for raising the price. The fact that protected industries are unwilling to surrender their protection attests the truth of this statement.

It follows, therefore, Mr. Chairman, as a logical necessity, that the enhanced price thus received by reason of the absence of competition constitutes the "protection" on the article, whilst, at the same time, it can be neither successfully controverted nor gainsaid that such increased price is paid by those who consume; that is to say, the "protection" is extended at the expense of the party who does the protecting, the American consumer. In this view it is at once desirable and pertinent to inquire as to the membership of this "protective system," which has so intrenched itself within the affections of its votaries that they prefer to strike off the tax from whisky, tobacco, and oleomargarine rather than "surrender any part" of their Government bounty.

WAGES OF LABOR.

Mr. Chairman, who, then, are the beneficiaries of the "protective system?" The laborers in protected industries are in no wise benefited by its operation, although the manufacturers of protected articles have constantly demanded and received the increased price under the direct plea that their laborers should share in such profits. The experience of the last thirty years not only attests the entire accuracy of this statement, but further shows that the laborers in protected industries have been at all times confronted with competition in the free-trade labor market, in no case receiving more than their competitive value in such market, where the wage is fixed by the inexorable law of supply and demand.

Mr. Chairman, I will not at present attempt to elaborate this phase of the tariff question further than to advert to the fact that the laboring men in protected industries enunciated their views and conclusions for themselves in the recent Presidential contest. It is no longer in issue. The result in Connecticut, New Jersey, and other manufacturing districts voiced their convictions for Cleveland and commercial freedom.

They have learned by the hard lessons of experience how misleading and untrue was that motto displayed in the last campaign on

Republican banners which read "Protection fills the dinner-pail." The laborers employed by Andrew Carnegie at Pittsburgh who were compelled, subsequent to the election of Mr. Harrison, to submit to a reduction of their wages under the shadow of Pinkerton detectives, armed with Winchester rifles, know that their dinner-pails have not been so filled; and how often has it been in the history of the country that these dinner-pails have been filled by contributions from charitable people!

But I will not pursue this question further at the present moment, for I desire to review the condition of the farming population.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Before the gentleman leaves the point he has just been discussing, how does he explain that the city of Joliet, one of the greatest manufacturing cities in the West, employing more than five thousand laborers, went Republican for the first time in 1888?

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman refer to labor employed in the penitentiary?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, Mr. Chairman, I stated substantially that the laboring men employed in "protected industries" had almost everywhere recognized the fallacy of the Republican position on this question. I am not advised as to the conditions which prevailed at Joliet; but I do know that one of the districts of the city of Chicago—a manufacturing district—sent FRANK LAWLER to Congress in 1886 backed by only 16 majority, while in 1888 on a platform of freer trade and lower taxes he was indorsed by over 6,000 majority. I have not referred to the city of St. Louis, in the State from which I come, for it is notorious and "known of all men" that the result in that city was largely due to the contribution of money by "protected industries," which carried it for the Republican party and elected three members to this House.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, in relation to what he has said as to the first election of Mr. LAWLER, there was a controversy among the Democrats themselves that reduced his majority, and when he received the majority that the gentleman speaks of it was not because there was any defection in the Republican ranks, but that the two wings of the Democratic party in the district pulled together.

Mr. DOCKERY. It seems, however, Mr. Chairman, according to the gentleman's own statement, that the position of the Democratic party did not lose Mr. LAWLER any votes among the laborers employed in the "protected industries."

Mr. CLUNIE (to Mr. DOCKERY). It also increased the Democratic vote in San Francisco 7,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. My friend from California suggests to me that the laboring men of San Francisco recorded their approval of Mr. Cleveland's position by increasing the Democratic majority 7,000 as between 1884 and 1888.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman has not answered my question. I asked him how he could account for the fact that the city of Joliet, Ill., which is a city of 20,000 inhabitants, went Republican for the first time in 1888, directly upon a protective tariff.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am not acquainted with the local conditions which prevailed at Joliet, but it is possible—however I do not assert it as a fact, as I do not know—that the same influences that were at work in the city of St. Louis might have also operated in the city of Joliet.

CAN NOT PROTECT FARMERS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us inquire whether the farmer is entitled to membership as a beneficiary of the "protective system." It is material to the proper understanding of this question to remember that the purpose of the system is to prohibit "imports of such articles as are produced by our people," or, in other words, to keep out foreign commodities the like of which are raised by our own farmers. Tried by this fundamental proposition, let us ascertain whether it is possible to protect our Western farmers under any system of high tariff. I am the more prompted to this inquiry by the demand of the Iowa Republicans in their recent platform for the "same protection to farm products that is given to the products of labor in other classes." The principal output of the farms of the West are corn, wheat, hay, cattle, hogs, oats, potatoes, lard, butter, honey, rye, cheese, and wheat flour. I find the existing tariff tax on the like foreign articles to be as follows:

Corn, 10 cents per bushel; wheat, 20 cents per bushel; hay, \$2 per ton; cattle and hogs, 20 per cent. ad valorem; oats, 10 cents per bushel; potatoes, 15 cents per bushel; lard, 2 cents per pound; butter, 4 cents per pound; honey, 20 cents per gallon; rye, 10 cents per bushel; cheese, 4 cents per pound; wheat flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the McKinley bill advances the tariff rates upon this entire list it still goes without saying that it is not within the power of any tariff to raise the price of a single one of these agricultural products, unless it can be demonstrated that they are brought into competition with the like foreign articles. It is scarcely necessary to refer to statistics to show the fact that instead of having to meet foreign competition on our own soil European countries are obliged to look to us to supply their own deficiencies, for the reason

that these countries do not now, nor have they within the past century, produced a sufficient quantity of agricultural products to supply their home demand. Our agricultural exports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, amounted to \$532,141,490, the principal items being:

Breadstuffs, including corn, corn-meal, oats, wheat, and wheat flour.....	\$123,876,661
Provisions, including beef, hogs, mutton, dairy products, etc.....	104,122,444
Live-stock.....	18,374,805
Raw cotton.....	237,775,270

Again, Mr. Chairman, will some gentleman on the other side of the Chamber explain how it is possible to raise the price of agricultural products for the Western farmer by a tariff that shuts out competition, in the teeth of the fact that there is no competition? I await an answer. [After a pause.] Don't all speak at once. [Laughter and applause.] Why, sir, the experience of all these farmers, as well as the statistics of the Treasury Department, will confirm the truth of the statement, when I affirm that foreign corn, foreign wheat, foreign cattle, foreign hogs, and other like products, except for special purposes, are never sold in this market, nor would they seek a market here under a system of absolute free trade.

Mr. MORSE. Will the honorable gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

Mr. DOCKERY. With pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. Does the gentleman pretend to say to the country that we have no competition in agricultural products coming from Canada?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am obliged to the gentleman for the question, because it suggests another injustice in the operations of the existing tariff system.

The Western farmers have not been confronted with foreign competition in their home market, and no argument of the gentleman—it matters not how eloquent—can convince them to the contrary. The only agricultural competition worthy of the slightest consideration is manifest either on the Rio Grande or the Canadian border.

The effect of the tariff, therefore, as may be plainly seen, is to burden the Western farmer without any compensating advantage, whilst at the same time it operates as a tax upon the Eastern farmer and those who labor in all the varied avocations along the line of our border, for the reason that they are compelled to pay the duty upon all their agricultural imports. In other words, it is cheaper for them to pay the duty upon agricultural products than it is to pay railroad transportation. In all such cases the duty is added to the cost of the article and paid by those who consume the imported agricultural products.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman will assist me in abolishing the long and short haul clause in the infamous interstate-commerce law that will prevent this discrimination.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, well, I do not intend to be diverted from the discussion of the question under consideration. The responsibility for whatever defects there may be in the interstate-commerce law rests with equal weight upon both political parties, and it is not my purpose to occupy any part of the time allotted to me in the discussion of that question.

Mr. Chairman, let us for a moment consider the nature of the so-called competition which confronts the Western farmer and in the opinion of our Republican friends is the cause of the depression that now encompasses him about. It may also be well to advert briefly to some of the remedies proposed in this bill.

The statement of our foreign commerce for the last fiscal year shows that we exported 88,600,742 bushels of wheat, in the form of wheat and flour, whilst our imports were but 1,946 bushels. The McKinley bill, realizing the imminent danger to the Western farmers by reason of such large (?) importations of wheat, proposes to relieve them from this peril by advancing the rate of duty on wheat from 20 to 25 cents per bushel, so as to hereafter keep out the 1,946 bushels of foreign wheat. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. That is good so far as it goes.

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, Mr. Chairman, if my friend were acquainted with agriculture he would know that the 1,946 bushels of wheat was bought by the farmers of the West and other sections of the country for seed purposes, and that the effect of the McKinley bill, if it keeps out that 1,946 bushels of foreign wheat and to that extent "relieves" the farmers from competition, will be to prevent those same farmers from securing superior seed-wheat from the older countries. Why, sir, less than a section of land in the agricultural district from which I come will raise more wheat than was imported into the United States during the last fiscal year from foreign countries.

Again, Mr. Chairman, official statistics show that during the last fiscal year we sold to foreign countries 69,592,929 bushels of corn, whilst we bought in the same period from them only 2,388 bushels. The McKinley bill, alert and ever-watchful, recognizes in the importation of these 2,388 bushels of seed-corn a peril of overshadowing magnitude to the farmers of my section, and forthwith advances the tariff rate on corn to from 10 cents to 15 cents per bushel, so as to hereafter prohibit our farmers from polluting American soil with foreign seed-corn.

This is another measure of "relief" that is offered to the farmers, and I leave it to the chairman of this committee, who is an admirable lawyer and I doubt not also an excellent mathematician, or to some

other gentleman on that side of the House, to estimate at his leisure moments how long it will require such measures of "relief" to lift the mortgages that now encumber the farms of the West. [Laughter.]

The utter fallacy of the Republican theory, which assumes that Western farm products are brought into competition with like foreign products and can therefore be "protected" by a tariff, is further revealed in the following summary of our foreign trade for the last fiscal year. These statistics are decisive and conclusive. They show that our exports of corn-meal were 312,186 barrels, while our imports were only 396 bushels; our exports of rye, 287,252 bushels, imports only 16 bushels, and the exports and imports of other farm products were as follows:

Tallow: Exports, 77,844,555 pounds; imports, only 34,931 pounds. Lard: Exports, 318,242,990 pounds; imports, only 1,703 pounds. Beef, mutton, and pork: Exports, 286,991,121 pounds; imports, but 215,575 pounds. Bacon and hams: Exports, 400,224,646 pounds; imports, but 272,130 pounds. Apples, dried: Exports, 22,101,579 pounds; imports, none reported. Apples, green or ripe: Exports, 942,406 barrels; imports, none reported. Oats: Exports, 624,226 bushels; imports, but 22,324 bushels.

I should now be glad, sir, if some gentleman on the other side would kindly state to the House how protection could or did advantage the farmer in the sale of all the items which constituted the more than five hundred and thirty-two millions of agricultural products sent to foreign markets during the last fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it is simply not possible to give the mortgaged Iowa Republican farmers or any other farmers of the West "the same protection that is given to the products of labor in other classes;" neither is it possible, as expressed in the phrase of the President, to "apply the protective principle to the products of our farms."

A tariff under no conceivable guise, nor adjusted upon any possible scale, can avail to raise the price of the corn consumed as fuel by the farmers of Kansas or appreciate the price of any other product of the field. It would be as logical to attempt to check the course of a Kansas cyclone with a barrier of Kansas grasshoppers as to anticipate such results from a tariff.

Let me repeat again, Mr. Chairman, and emphasize the proposition, that a protective tax can only benefit the products of labor in this country when such products are brought into competition with like foreign products, and that it is therefore apparent that the existing tariff rates, alike with the McKinley bill in their assumption of protecting the corn, cattle, hogs, wheat, and other products of the farm, are illusive, elusive, and delusive, a deception intended to ensnare the ignorant and uninformed. Indeed, sir, there is only one product of the Western farm that can, under the theory of protective reasoning, be supposed in anywise to enjoy the benefits of the system, and that article is wool.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. How about barley? How much barley was brought into this country from Canada last year?

Mr. DOCKERY. I have the statistics here. Doubtless the gentleman is familiar with them. I believe there was a larger importation of barley than of any other agricultural product.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Ten million bushels last year.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well. So far as my section of the country is concerned, we have but little interest in the production of barley. It is imported from foreign countries because it can be produced cheaper elsewhere than we can produce it.

Mr. DINGLEY. What about flaxseed? Last year flaxseed to the value of \$7,691,763 was imported. Of beans and potatoes there were importations to the value of \$2,295,477, and of some of the more prominent agricultural products, of which I have a list in my hand, the aggregate importation was over \$68,000,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, the explanation I have already made of the operation of the tariff tax along the Canadian border applies to all the agricultural products to which the gentlemen have referred. I may add, however, that I could never understand the philosophy that induced the Republican party to put a tariff tax on potatoes, unless it be an attempt, as I have heard suggested, to catch the Irish vote. [Laughter.] In this view the tariff has proved to be a dismal failure.

Mr. MORSE. There were three cargoes of potatoes brought from Scotland to Boston last year.

Mr. DOCKERY. I have already given the explanation for that importation, and have not the time to reiterate, as I notice that my time is fast passing and the gavel of the Chairman will soon descend. Before passing, however, from this phase of the tariff question I desire to say that we purchased agricultural products of Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, to the value of \$17,341,576, whilst for the same period we sold to Canada surplus farm products amounting in value to \$21,582,836. The policy of the McKinley bill is to prohibit these exchanges, although it is apparent that the United States had an advantage in the barter of \$4,241,260. I may also add that I have made a careful examination of the agricultural import trade of this country for the last fiscal year, and find that of these imports only \$16,935,892 can be said to compete in any wise with the products of Western farms; and, as a matter of fact, there is no real competition even to this extent.

WOOL TARIFF.

Wool, Mr. Chairman, is the keystone of the arch which binds the great body of agriculturists to the protective system. If it were possible to protect the farmer in any aspect or degree by a tariff it must be in respect to this one product. As I have, however, discussed this question at some length on a former occasion, I shall content myself at this time with a brief summary of its salient features. It is evident, then, sir, that wool offers the only basis upon which the Western farmer can indulge the hope of sharing the benefits of protection, as it is apparent that foreign competition with any other product of the Western farm is a *prima facie* absurdity, tariff or no tariff.

Wool, Mr. Chairman, sustains a unique relation to tariff taxation because this country not only produces less than one-half of the wool required for home consumption, but also fails to produce all the classes of wool essential in the manufacture of the best grades of woollen goods. Most of our wools are of the inferior grades and are best adapted to the "filling" of manufactured goods, while the superior fibered wools of England and Australia are peculiarly adapted to what is classified as "warps." Wools from the Territories and the Southwest are largely of the cheaper grades, and are hence valueless for the manufacture of the better class of woollen fabrics unless mixed with foreign wools.

The most reliable estimate of the wool clip in the United States for the year 1888 fixed the product at 265,000,000 pounds, whilst the estimate of our necessary consumption for the same year required 600,000,000 pounds either of raw wool or its equivalent in manufactured woollen fabrics. The importation of raw wool for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, was in excess of 126,000,000 pounds, thus leaving a deficiency of a little over 200,000,000 pounds, which was overcome by the importation of manufactured woollen goods amounting in value to \$52,681,482.56. On these the Government collected tariff taxes amounting in round numbers to forty-two millions.

The present duty of 10 cents per pound on wool is largely instrumental in forbidding the importation of foreign wool, the pernicious effects of which are seen in the large importation of woollen goods of foreign manufacture, and wholly out of foreign wool, thus depriving the American laborer, the American wool-grower, and the American manufacturer of business and employment to which they are justly entitled, and which would be secured to them under any correct system of taxation.

The interests of the wool-grower and of the wool-manufacturer are indissolubly associated, the prosperity of the manufacturer being essential to the prosperity of the wool-grower, inasmuch as the former furnishes the only market for the disposition of that product. The existing tariff on wool averages 33.26 per cent., whilst the rate on woollen goods averages 69.49 per cent.; and yet, sir, with these sturdy protective barriers, the depression in both of these industries was never more pronounced than at this moment. The price of wool has depreciated in a marked degree, whilst utter ruin and bankruptcy confront the woollen manufacturer.

Since the election of Mr. Harrison upon a platform especially championing protected wool and condemning "the proposition of the Democratic party to place wool on the free-list," at the same time insisting that the duties on wool should be "adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry," woollen manufacturers in large numbers have closed down, labor has been driven into enforced idleness, while scores of establishments have gone into the hands of receivers.

Sir, if the existing depression in that industry continues the logical sequence of this phase of the protective system will be the expensive appliances of a national bankrupt act. That neither the wool-grower nor the manufacturer has prospered under this policy of exclusion the history of these industries fully establishes. The rate of duty imposed on wool by the tariff act of March 2, 1867, averaged 40.59 per cent., and was found to be so unsatisfactory in its operations that it was slightly lowered by the Republican party in the act of March 3, 1883, in accordance with the recommendation of President Arthur.

The scale of taxation fixed by both measures was intrinsically prohibitory, and their results may be scanned in the following brief review and analysis. In 1868 the number of sheep in the United States amounted to 38,991,912, which after twenty years of protection had only increased to 42,599,079; in 1868 the value of our sheep was \$98,407,809 and in 1888 only \$90,640,369; in 1868 the wool product was 180,000,000 pounds, in 1888 only 265,000,000 pounds; in 1868 the import of wool was 39,275,926 pounds, whilst in 1888, notwithstanding the onerous duties on the foreign product, the import aggregated 113,558,753 pounds.

Thus briefly analyzed these statistics tell a story of disaster to wool under a system of protection for two long decades, showing an increase of only 3,607,167 sheep, increased production of but 85,000,000 pounds (which is almost equaled by the increased importation of foreign wools, amounting to 74,282,827 pounds), and a decrease in the value of sheep of \$7,767,440. These statistics furnish their own best commentary when we remember that our population in these twenty years has almost doubled; and, whilst it may furnish ground for reflection that the tariff barrier has not at all times proven an effectual one, some of the largest importations of foreign wool having been made under the sway of the highest protection, notably in 1871 and 1879, yet in all such in-

stances the tariff has proved a grievous burden, the law of supply and demand being compelled to operate at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand the gentleman from Missouri to assert that the production of wool in this country has fallen off per inhabitant since 1860? Is he not aware that, on the contrary, it has increased from 1½ pounds per inhabitant to 5½ pounds per inhabitant in that period?

Mr. DOCKERY. I did not so state. I stated that the production of wool in this country in 1868 was 180,000,000 pounds and that in 1888, notwithstanding the enormous increase of population, the production was but 265,000,000 pounds, while the value of our sheep had decreased in twenty years about \$8,000,000. These are the official figures and can not be called in question. I do not remember what the production was in 1860.

FREE WOOL.

Sir, there is but one avenue of escape from the depression that now clouds the outlook of these industries and hinders their prosperity, and it is found in the pathway alone that leads to free wool and to a corresponding or greater reduction of the taxes on the manufactured products. The results of such legislation will be to enable our manufacturers to secure all classes and grades of wool freed from the burdens of taxation and so to enable them to supply the American market with woolen goods, thus driving England from our markets where for so many years she has found a ready sale for about fifty millions annually of woolen goods.

To this auspicious result will be added the establishment and enlargement of a foreign market. Untaxed wool will then enable our manufacturers to sell their goods at a lower cost and thus give them that post of vantage in the marts of the world upon which our manufacturers of leather have stood since hides were taken from the dutiable and placed on the free list in 1872. In this consummation the American wool-grower will reap the twofold encouragement of increased demand and increased price for his product consequent upon the enlarged market for our manufactures both at home and abroad.

That a mixture of American and foreign wools will, by reason of the facts to which I have adverted, inure to the benefit of our wool-growers finds ample evidence and confirmation in the statement that wool was higher before the war, when free of duty, than it has been at any subsequent time. But even, Mr. Chairman, if it were true, as is claimed by our friends on the other side of this Chamber, that a removal of the duty on wool and a reduction on its manufactured products, as proposed in the Mills bill of the last Congress, should result in the lowering of the prices of such products to the amount of the abrogated duty, still, sir, would I be found advocating the step, because it is in entire accord with the doctrine of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Again, Mr. Chairman, whilst the wool-grower may suffer some loss under the suggested remedy, the wool-consumer will be largely the beneficiary. The census reveals the fact in this connection that in the State from which I come there are nearly 1,000,000 more consumers than there are sheep; and as between the consumers and the sheep I have but little hesitation in declaring my preponderance of interest and sympathy for the consumer. [Laughter.]

Let us examine for a moment, however, the effect of removing the tax upon wool and reducing the duty upon its manufactured products as proposed in the bill of the last session. By the census of 1880 it appears that the population of the ten counties constituting the district I have the honor to represent was 158,316; the number of sheep, 182,369; the number of farms, 21,806; the production of wool, 1,016,148 pounds; the average number of sheep per farm, 8; and the average pounds of wool to each farm, 46. If, therefore, the removal of the tax upon wool should entail a loss equal to 10 cents per pound of duty the average loss to each farmer would be \$4.60, a total loss to the ten counties on the 1,016,148 pounds of \$101,614.80.

In order, however, that we may fairly estimate on which side of the ledger the profit or loss should properly appear, it is necessary to take into account the saving effected by the lower price of the manufactured goods. The census of 1880 shows the per capita consumption of domestic and imported wool in its various forms to be \$6.50, which, multiplied by five, would show the average consumption of each family to be \$32.50. The reduction of 29 per cent. upon manufactured goods proposed by the Mills bill would thus reduce the cost of woolen goods to each family in the sum of \$9.42; and when from this is deducted the \$4.60 of duty on the 46 pounds of wool raised on each farm, the result is a net gain of \$4.82 to each family of five persons, or of 96 cents to each individual member thereof.

Multiplying this individual gain by the total population of 158,316, we find that the annual saving to the consumers of woolen fabrics in my district, under the Mills bill, would be \$151,983.36. Again, Mr. Chairman, by the official statistics of 1880, it appears that Missouri had a population of 2,168,380; number of farms, 215,575; production of wool, 7,313,924 pounds; number of sheep, 1,411,298; number of sheep to each farm, 6; number of pounds of wool to each farm, 33. By applying the same method of calculation, we discover that free wool and a reduction of 29 per cent. on its varied manufacture would save to each family in the State, \$6.12; to each individual member of such family, \$1.22; and to the entire population of 2,168,380, the significant and handsome sum of \$2,645,423.60.

In the light, therefore, Mr. Chairman, of an unbiased consideration of the relation of wool and its manufactured results to both the existing tariff and the prices realized under its schedules, the conclusion must be reached that the tax on wool is a hindrance to that industry, both operating to restrict the markets for its manufactures and enhancing the price of the products of a commodity of universal consumption.

And right here, Mr. Chairman, I desire to enter my emphatic protest against that feature of the McKinley bill to which our attention was invited on yesterday which gives the foreigner the benefit of cheap American goods and denies that privilege to the American customer. This gross injustice is wrought in that provision of the bill which gives the manufacturer untaxed raw material for the goods he manufactures for the foreign trade whilst at the same time charging him the full duty on the raw material entering into goods for the home market.

Mr. WADE. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. With pleasure.

Mr. WADE. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not know that the low rate of duty on low, coarse grades of wool has driven the coarse-wool sheep out of this country? Do you not know that that is true of your own State?

Mr. DOCKERY. No, sir; I do not. Why, sir, that whole question was fully reviewed in the tariff discussion in 1888, and I thought my colleague from Missouri [Mr. WADE] heard the very elaborate presentation I made of that subject at the time, but it seems to have escaped his memory.

Mr. WADE. Well, I say to my colleague that I do know that what I have stated is true.

Mr. DOCKERY. The major part of the wool that we raise in this country consists of the low, cheap-grade wools which are produced in the Western States and Territories; and, to quote the language of the leading Republican paper of my State when defending the reduction of the wool duty in 1883, I will say that "wool-growing is bound to increase in importance on the plains and in Texas and California and to become less and less important in Ohio and the East, tariff or no tariff."

Mr. WADE. May I correct my colleague's statement?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WADE. I want to say to you that if you know anything about this question you do know that there has been an increase in the fine wool sheep in this country; and you do know, if you know anything about it, that there has been a very large reduction in the coarse-grade sheep, and that the low rate of duty has prevented the growth of the coarse sheep and coarse-wool industry in your own State, and has in fact wiped it out.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what I know about this matter. [Laughter.] The gentleman's style of statement and argument are somewhat peculiar. It is not for me, Mr. Chairman, to pass upon the question of my knowledge or lack of knowledge on this subject, and I certainly hope that the House will not be called upon to pass on the proficiency of the gentleman himself on this or other questions. [Laughter.]

I desire, however, to say that whatever depreciation there may be in the value of sheep or whatever decrease there is in the number of sheep in my State has come to pass under a tariff which was enacted by the Republican party, over the protest of this side of the House.

Mr. WADE. Well, we are going to correct that now.

Mr. DOCKERY. The revision of 1883 only made a slight reduction of the duty on wool.

There is now a high rate of duty on wool, averaging, as I have heretofore stated, 33.26 per cent., and from 1867 to 1883 there was a still higher rate; so that whatever decrease there has been in my State in the number and value of sheep has occurred under the highest wool tariff ever known in this country, and which was imposed by the Republican party.

HOME MARKET.

Mr. Chairman, the illusory assumption that a protective tariff is essential to the prosperity of our manufacturing industries and that without the aid of such a bounty these great interests would decline and decay becomes apparent in the history of the low-tariff era from 1846 to 1861. The exhibit of official statistics alike with the testimony of those who had actual knowledge of the business operations of that period established beyond cavil the marvelous prosperity of that epoch, a prosperity which was especially accentuated in what are now known as the protected industries.

The great leader of the Republican party, Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, himself bears witness to the accuracy of these facts so important in this connection, as upon the express claim that Government aid is essential to the establishment and continuance of manufactures reposes the expensive fallacy of the home-market theory. A very large number of our agriculturists have hitherto maintained this theory and sustained the system under the apprehension that the abolition of protection would speedily result in ruin to the manufacturer and so drive those employed in manufactures into agricultural and other pursuits, crowding the already overcrowded, and thus lessening the opportunity to the farmer of disposing of his surplus products.

This assumption is wholly without substantial foundation in fact, as

the experience of these sixteen years abundantly attests. With the advantage of untaxed raw materials our manufacturers could safely challenge the competition of the world in the sale of at least 90 per cent. of their products. The home market they could easily hold against all comers at least to that extent, the report of the Bureau of Statistics showing that under the low tariff of 1850 the United States consumed 88.39 per cent. of our own manufactures; that in 1860, with a tariff still lower, the home consumption was 87.57 per cent.; and that in 1880 the percentage was still more pronounced, the United States consuming of home-manufactured goods 92.58 per cent., with only 7.42 per cent. of foreign manufactures.

We can, therefore, as is thus seen, Mr. Chairman, challenge the competition of the entire outside world, because with our superior labor and unrivaled machinery, coupled with our natural advantages, we can manufacture at least this percentage lower than any other nation of the earth. It follows, therefore, that protection is not essential to the growth and development of manufactures, whilst at the same time we have shown that the tax imposed under this erroneous hypothesis falls most heavily upon the unprotected farmers.

The protective system, indeed, sir, not only fails to give the farmer the advantage of the boasted home market, but has further operated as a hindrance to him, in decreasing the profits on what he has to sell abroad. This additional damage is revealed in the reflection that commerce between nations is but an exchange of surplus products, and that such exchange should be free and uninterrupted, subject only to such exactions as are necessary for legitimate governmental needs. Farmers, moreover, are, more than any other class, interested in freer trade, or, as our Republican friends would express it, "reciprocal trade," for the reason that they must find a market abroad for a large per cent. of their products, the home market being an utterly inadequate one.

The interests of the farmer, therefore, demanding an enlarged market, anything that operates in this behalf will inure to his benefit, and anything that obstructs or limits the market will lessen his opportunity for satisfactory prices in exact proportion to the measure or extent of such restriction. The farm products of this country sold abroad during the last fiscal year constituted about 15 per cent. of the entire agricultural output, while the American manufacturers sold in the home market in 1880 their entire product, with the exception of 1.48 per cent.

The average amount sold abroad of agricultural products for a number of years has been at least 15 per cent. of the entire crop. The intensity of this agricultural export is more clearly apprehended if we first deduct the consumption necessary for the farmers' own use, and when this obvious consideration enters into our estimate it will be found, Mr. Chairman, that at least one-half of all the surplus of the farmer goes abroad for sale.

We might pertinently state just here that we sold abroad in 1880 5.7 per cent. of the value of our corn, 39.2 per cent. of our wheat, and 12 per cent. of our meats. For the fiscal year 1889 the per cent. of the exportation of corn and wheat was considerably less, corn being 3.6 per cent. and wheat 21.3 per cent. In fact, there has been a decreasing exportation for several years, exemplifying not an increase of home consumption, but indicating a decadence of the farm industry and consequent depreciation in the value of its products.

Upon this point Senator TELLER, of Colorado, in a recent debate was coerced into an admission which was startling in its explicitness and significance. He confessed that although the wheat crop of 1880 exceeded that of 1889 by only 8,000,000 bushels its value was \$180,000,000 greater and that whilst the corn crop of 1882 was actually 500,000,000 bushels less than that of 1889 it was at the same time worth \$78,000,000 more than last year's crop.

He also furnished a graphic summary of the whole situation in the statement that the farmer who in 1880 purchased a farm for which he expected to pay in corn and wheat found that he must now sell from 135 to 140 bushels to realize what in that year he obtained upon 100 bushels; that he must now part with 30 per cent. more of pork than he did in 1880 to realize the same amount of money; and that a similar ratio of depreciation ran through the entire range of farm products.

Mr. Chairman, the disheartening facts as set forth by Senator TELLER have but recently received an alarming official confirmation. The Illinois Agricultural Report shows that the corn crop of that State for the year 1889 actually cost \$10,000,000 more than its estimated value, the latter, estimating the crop at 23 cents per bushel, being placed at \$58,337,019, while the cost of its production was \$68,273,872.

And just here, sir, we must not forget that of the 17,392,099 persons engaged in the various avocations of life the farmers constitute 7,690,493, or in round numbers one-half, furnishing products which amount annually to from 75 to 80 per cent. of the entire export trade of the country, while those engaged in manufactures constitute but 2,623,089 persons, or but 15 per cent. of the entire population, while of the export trade they furnish only from 15 to 18 per cent.

A careful study of these statistics only serves to emphasize the inequalities of the present system, an emphasis which grows sharper when we remember that the farmers of the United States, in 1880,

had invested in farms and farm implements a total capital of \$10,603,616,821, which yielded products valued at \$2,213,402,564, whilst the manufacturers, with a capital of but \$2,790,272,606, realized a product the estimated value of which was \$5,369,579,191. In other words, the manufacturers with but one-fourth the capital realized a product of more than twice the value of the farmers' product. These figures furnish their own significant commentary upon the relation of farmers and manufacturers to the "home-market theory," as well as upon the profits realized in each industry.

DISAPPOINTED REPUBLICAN FARMERS.

And now, Mr. Chairman, discarding for the moment both theory and argument, let us come to a brief review of the condition of the home market, as its present status becomes peculiarly significant, following as it does so closely upon the recent triumph of the "home market theory." A little more than twelve months ago the skies were radiant with auspicious omens to the Western Republican farmer; he stood upon the threshold of an era which seemed to him bright with the assurance of "good times."

With banners blazoned with stirring and exultant watchwords, with torch and transparency and the tread of a mighty host, he kept step to the music of protective promises. Was it strange, Mr. Chairman, if his pulse beat strong and quick and his eye kindled with the light of buoyant hope? What, then, has been the outcome of Republican promises and the glowing anticipations they awakened in the mind of this Western Republican farmer? Why, sir, it has been far sadder than the hope deferred which maketh the heart sick. To him it has been the passing away of a delusion to which he has clung for years as the prop of his waning fortunes.

In the bitterness of blighted expectations he feels that in the language of Scripture he has been wounded in the house of his friends; and to-day face to face with mortgaged farm and ruinous prices his mind sadly reverts to the lamentations of Bunyan's pilgrim in the Slough of Despond. Will any gentleman on the other side of this Chamber assert that this picture is overdrawn? If so, listen to the admission so recently reluctantly wrung from one of the leading Republican journals of the West, a paper which has been pronounced, persistent, and untiring in its advocacy of the protective theory:

Their [the farmers'] business has become unprofitable, in spite of all their industry and economy; and they are firmly of the opinion that this is due to causes which can be and should be removed, causes for which they are not responsible, but which involve devices of injustice and unfairness aimed strictly against them. The prices which they are obliged to accept for their grain are below the actual cost of production. There are millions of bushels of corn west of the Mississippi River which will not bring enough to pay for taking it to market. Live-stock can not be sold for much above the expense of feeding. The farmer can not get a decent remuneration for his labor in any branch of his calling; he is lucky if he realizes as much as a dollar a day, counting nothing for interest on his investment.

It will be seen at a glance that these people have substantial reasons for complaint. There is manifestly something wrong somewhere, and they can not be blamed for seeking to find out what it is and to have it corrected. The familiar argument of overproduction is not a sufficient explanation and answer in their case. They can readily sell all they produce at the prevailing prices, which proves that it is needed for consumption. The supply does not exceed the demand or they could not sell the surplus at any price. They know very well that all the food products which they turn off year by year are consumed; and they have a right to demand a reasonable return for the work by which those products are made available for the uses of all other classes. The question is one of vital importance to them. Adverse influences have placed them where they can not make a decent living by the hardest toil and closest saving; and they have a right to demand a fair share of the proceeds of their labor.

Mr. Chairman, I speak within the limits of truth when I say, in view of the causes which have wrought this ruin, that I have never read a more remorseless arraignment of the protective theory than the one so graphically portrayed in this editorial utterance. Its cold phrases read like a legal indictment. Indeed, sir, it has more than one legal resemblance; it sounds like the confession of the culprit who says, "The game is up. All is discovered. I might as well tell the whole truth."

And yet, Mr. Chairman, in this unhappy confession there is one touch of irony so exquisite as to cast a gleam of light upon the darkness of the picture. "There is," says the writer, "manifestly something wrong somewhere;" that is to say, after more than a quarter of a century of protective treatment it is suddenly discovered that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark," that the patient is sick well nigh unto death, and that his friends "can not be blamed for seeking to find out what it is [this something wrong] and to have it corrected."

Sir, this vision of calamity is not a mere flashing of the distempered fancy of the writer, but it is a sober record of disastrous facts! I hold in my hand the synopsis of a recent bulletin of the Agricultural Department, which I will read:

The returns of prices of farm products to the Department of Agriculture are lower than ever before. The lowest average estimated value of corn in former years was 31.8 cents in 1878, and since that date 32.8 in 1885. The present average is 29.1 cents. The average of wheat estimates is 70.6 cents. This is not the lowest, as the average in December, 1884, was 64.5; in 1887, 68.1; in 1886, 68.7 cents. The average price of oats is lower than ever before reported. In 1878 it was 24.6 cents per bushel; at the present it is 23 cents. Prices of barley, rye, and buckwheat are also very low.

And, sir, if it is necessary to emphasize the fact that there is "something wrong somewhere" in our fiscal policy, I have only to state that in the newspaper from which I clipped this synopsis appeared dis-

patches from Pittsburgh, Pa., announcing that representatives of the iron and steel manufacturers of the United States were assembling for the purpose of advancing prices. Mr. Chairman, these facts themselves contain a lucid exposition of the fallacy of the "home market theory." And, sir, of this great harvest of ruin now being garnered, the Democratic party has not sowed a grain. Against argument and admonition the Republican party has sowed to the wind, and it will reap the whirlwind in the reckoning soon to be had with a deceived and despairing agricultural constituency.

There is, sir, an ingenuity of sophistry indulged in by the advocates of protection, whose aim seems to be to vindicate the policy of "heads I win, tails you lose." When, despite their greatly advertised panacea of a "home market," ruinous prices obtain for the products of the field, they are fluent with the laws of supply and demand; but when prices grow liberal and encouraging the argument is adroitly shifted and the result is attributed to the blessings of a high tariff. When congenial European and Asiatic suns and propitious seasons make the competition hot and heavy in European markets and the Western farmer succumbs before it, then the law of supply and demand they declare to be unavoidable.

If, however, flood, or frost, or adverse seasons, or other causes reduce the foreign yield, and hence the demand becomes imperative for our cereals, the result is, under the flexible logic of this system, accredited to protection. The tariff at once becomes the guardian genius of the golden grain, before whose magic wand the valleys burst forth into singing and all the hills clap their hands with joy. I have always heard, Mr. Chairman, that it was a poor rule that would not work both ways, but, sir, in the operations of this "home market theory" we have a law of such rare and unprecedented merit that its triumphant course is unaffected by the facts of the case, by the logical operation of cause and effect, or by the economic law of supply and demand.

Indeed, sir, when protectionists draw upon the armory of political economy, they unwittingly choose a two-edged sword in their attempt to shelter themselves behind this law of supply and demand as an explanation of the prevailing low prices, inasmuch as it inevitably and logically involves the concession that higher prices must be and are determined by the same law.

TRUSTS.

Mr. Chairman, I come now in the order of my argument to a consideration of the protective system in its relation to those combinations which have so frequently and so arbitrarily limited production and increased the prices of the prime commodities of life, and which in commercial circles are classified as "trusts." And at the outset it is pertinent to remember that trusts were unknown during the low-tariff period, when the operation of wholesome and reasonable competition in all industries precluded their existence.

Their baneful presence is the logical outcome of a closed market, which is itself the characteristic result of the Republican policy of exclusion; and in making this declaration I am not unmindful of the position of the Republican party as announced in their last national platform. This utterance, however, fails to accord with the views of the present Secretary of State and of the distinguished gentleman who at this time presides over the deliberations of this body, the former having declared in a speech at Portland, Me., during the last Presidential canvass that—

Trusts are largely private affairs, with which neither President Cleveland nor any private citizen had any particular right to interfere.

Whilst the latter, in the great tariff discussion of 1888, expressed the conviction—

That there is no power on earth that can raise the price of any necessity of life above a just price and keep it there.

I shall not, however, attempt to reconcile the conflicting opinions of platform and leaders, but will merely submit the views of these eminent Republicans to the candid judgment of the Western Republican farmers who have during the last year been subject to the unprecedented exactions of trade combines, notably the binder-twine trust. The enhanced prices the farmers have been compelled to pay by reason of these organizations have coerced the Republican party of the West into a modification of its committal to protection, as appears from the recent Republican platform of Iowa. Here we discover that the demand for protection to American industries is reaffirmed, "where it does not foster trusts or trade conspiracies."

In this avowal of party faith there is a tacit confession that certain phases of the protective system do foster these "trusts or trade conspiracies," although the platform fails to indicate the precise point in the line of protected industries at which the criticism is applicable. The evil being recognized only in general terms it becomes necessary that we first ascertain the exact nature of this disease which is so vexatious to our agricultural interests, that we may thereby be enabled to suggest the remedy if it should be found to lie within the province of remedial legislation. A trust may be properly characterized as a combination of either individuals or corporations producing or dealing in a certain commodity which is so held or controlled by the combination in question that its production may be limited and its price thereby enhanced regardless of the cost of production, the supply of the article, or the demand therefor.

It being impossible to successfully operate a trust where the production of the article is widespread and the knowledge of the methods of its production general, it follows that a monopoly must be and is necessarily antecedent to the creation of a trust. While a monopoly, then, is the very basis of a trust or trade conspiracy, such monopoly may be the result of either natural or artificial laws. As an illustration of the monopolies that are the outgrowth of natural laws I might instance, as those most grievous and exacting, the anthracite coal trust, the Standard Oil trust, and the great cattle trust or dressed-beef monopoly of Chicago.

The anthracite coal trust is made possible from the fact that the production of this variety of coal is limited to a few mines in the State of Pennsylvania, whilst at the same time the ownership of the mines is confined to a few individuals. The Standard Oil trust is the result of the united ownership of a very great proportion of the wells which yield the oil, a trust originally buttressed by the discriminating favors of railroad transportation rates and now strengthened by the exclusive ownership of the patent for refining the oil. The Cattle trust, or dressed-beef monopoly, of Chicago, is the association of Nelson Morris, Swift, Armour, and a few others, for the purpose of forcing down the price of cattle, and thus securing this product at ruinously low figures for the use of this gigantic combination. This trust, which has plundered the farmers of the West by its ruthless and unscrupulous exactions, is a gross perversion of honest business methods and a travesty upon every element of fair dealing.

This special monopoly seems to be, in a certain measure, the outgrowth of our artificial and stimulated commercial civilization which calls for the aggregation of vast sums of capital and extensive appliances of improved machinery, thereby operating to exclude the organization of less pretentious industries and enabling these colossal trusts to overawe and intimidate competition. They are hurtful to every interest of the farmer, and whatever authority can be constitutionally exercised by Congress, the State Legislature, or the judiciary should be summarily interposed to subvert their power, and so limit prices to an equitable and legitimate profit upon invested capital. I am greatly gratified, sir, to be able to say that the Legislature of my own State has given a swift response to the demand of the people in this behalf by the enactment of a law that revokes the charters of all corporations which have so conspired and confederated against the general welfare.

It is not claimed that these types of trusts are related to tariff taxation any further than in the sympathy or kinship that must logically be developed because of their nature, effects, and general characteristics.

TARIFF TRUSTS.

The tariff, however, in its ultimate effect has fostered trusts by excluding competition, and thus establishing monopolies. A monopoly is, moreover, as heretofore stated, essential to the organization of trusts, because they can not prosper in the presence of competition, and therefore, wherever monopoly is, trusts follow as rich fruitage and inevitable sequence. That great political economist, John Stuart Mill, has well expressed the causes which establish monopoly in the pithy statement that "Where competition is not, monopoly is," or, as expressed by another eminent writer, "Where combination is possible, competition impossible."

The responsibility may therefore be located in the general averment that a high tariff precludes competition and that the absence of competition establishes monopoly, which in its turn encourages trusts, these not being able to exist when confronted with the healthy competitive laws of unfettered trade and commerce.

One phase of the theory of "protection," Mr. Chairman, seems, indeed, a fair fabric, beautiful to contemplate, resting as it does upon the guileless assumption that when foreign competition is excluded domestic competition will insure reasonable prices; but this illusion, which entirely ignores the selfishness of human nature, has been rudely dispelled by the logic of the situation.

The trust conspirator is fully indoctrinated with the idea of the Republican party that it is a sound public policy which banishes foreign competition, and he therefore logically proceeds to take the additional step of crushing out home competition as well, and hence it is that the sugar trust, the castor-oil trust, the linseed-oil trust, the nail trust, the binder-twine trust, and hundreds of other organizations equally rapacious have plundered the farmer and wasted his substance.

The paternal theory, therefore, Mr. Chairman, which finds expression in an obstructive tariff, is the origin of those rich and powerful associations which combine and confederate to dictate the amount and cost of life's inexorable necessities.

These tariff trusts, sir, are an increasing menace to our commercial prosperity, and no remedial legislation will be of enduring efficacy which shall deal alone with the symptoms and not the source of the evil. You must strike at the root in order that the branches may wither. With the removal of this obstructive tax will follow the normal flow of wholesome competition which will forever banish from our body politic these obnoxious parasites whose life springs from this prolific fountain of our great economic ailments.

Before passing from this question, Mr. Chairman, permit me to express the obligation I feel to the binder-twine trust, which has prob-

ably had more to do with striking the scales of the protective theory from the political vision of Republican farmers than any other one cause, and which has at last aroused them to the necessity of an enlarged market for their products, as well as cheaper necessities of life, if they shall ever hope to pay the Eastern mortgages which now encumber their farms.

FARM MORTGAGES.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us review somewhat further the condition of the American farmer as it has appeared for now nearly three decades under the ample and unbroken sway of the protective policy. If it can be shown that the system has brought prosperity and happiness to the farmer and has secured to him his just share in the distribution of wealth, then I am quite willing to concede to the Republican party a monopoly of merit and distinction, since every line of high-tariff legislation has been placed on the Federal statute-books by the votes of the Republican party and against the protest of the overwhelming majority of the masses of the Democratic party.

Mr. Chairman, it is well now and then in the controversies that may be had upon varying questions of public policy to discard theories and discussions for the time, and by the test of experience and actual results determine the merits or demerits of the subjects under consideration. For instance, if it be found that the agricultural wealth of the country has kept pace with the accumulation of wealth in other departments of industry and that comfort, prosperity, and happiness have characterized the farming classes, then it must be conceded that this policy is without fault and beyond the pale of candid criticism. Tried by this standard, let us ascertain whether wealth has in reality been added to the farmers of the country. And just at this point, before attempting a brief summary of the essential facts of the case, I wish to advert to one phase of the agricultural industry pregnant with present evil and ominous of ultimate disaster. I allude, Mr. Chairman, to the widespread presence of the farm mortgage.

Sir, I remember that in the great tariff debate of 1888 the eminent gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] employed his most pungent satire in ridiculing the assertions of this side of the House touching the impoverishment and mortgaged indebtedness of the Western farmer. Reverting to a Western trip, his comment was that "the land was so rich that if we had an acre of it in Maine we would have sold it by the bushel." Why, sir, the statement of the gentleman but gives a deeper color to the picture of disaster, for manifestly a soil of such prolific and redundant virtue can only fail of a satisfactory reward to the labors of the farmer when hampered by the extraneous and unnatural conditions of an inequitable and oppressive tariff.

It was never intended, Mr. Chairman, that such soil should be weighted with mortgages, and yet under a system of unequal taxation the "farm-mortgage industry" in the great West is perhaps the most vigorous of all the "protected" industries. For illustration, let us refer to the State of Illinois, where this industry has found full scope and ample play. Of that great Commonwealth, whose borders were never vexed by guerrillas, whose citizens were never pillaged by armies, and whose population is industrious and frugal, we have upon this question a recent exhibit emanating from Republican authority.

The official report of the Illinois bureau of labor statistics for 1888, on page 36, gives the following grim exhibit of the mortgaged indebtedness of 102 counties:

	Whole number of mortgages.	Cash total.	Property encumbered.
Lands.....	92,777	\$147,320,054	*8,082,794
Lots.....	142,750	246,704,827	†237,336
Chattels.....	74,740	22,354,187	
Totals.....	310,267	416,379,068	

* Acres.

† Lots.

Mr. Chairman, we further learn from the same official record that in the year 1887 alone there were filed 25,334 new farm mortgages, aggregating \$37,040,770 and covering 2,178,532 acres of land. We have here, then, the startling revelation that of the immense farm-mortgage indebtedness for the whole State of \$147,320,054 upon 8,082,794 acres, very nearly one-fourth of the amount was contracted within the year 1887, and yet, sir, this is far from an exceptional disclosure as concerning our great agricultural domain.

The untoward experience of the Illinois farmers is even more pronounced in Kansas, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, and other Western agricultural States, but I have selected the imperial State of Illinois to illustrate the ruinous decadence of agriculture because we have here the seal of official testimony. In this splendid Commonwealth we see the cumulative and accelerated sweep of disaster in one year alone, and when for the whole country the record is made up there will be a kindred story for the hills and valleys of New England, which bask in the sunshine of perpetual protection, and for the almost illimitable expanse of fertile soil that stretches away from the Alleghanies to the golden shores of the Pacific.

I can not forbear, sir, a single further allusion to the comment of the gentleman from Maine when he happily described the wealth of our soil, but the fallacy of whose inference may be well understood when the Illinois bureau of labor statistics, in their annual report for 1888, state that the heaviest mortgages in that State were found in the twenty-one counties possessing the greatest wealth in agricultural lands. I quote the exact language of the report in respect to this point.

These twenty-one counties, while encumbered with the greatest amount of mortgage debt, at the same time possess, with few exceptions, the greatest wealth in agricultural lands. The general deduction from this grouping is that the counties enumerated, constituting 20 per cent. of the whole number, contain 31 per cent. of the total acres, represent 33 per cent. of the total value, and sustain 41 per cent. of all the mortgage debt of the State.

An examination of the table giving the mortgaged indebtedness of these twenty-one wealthy agricultural counties shows that they comprise 10,807,767 acres, that their assessed valuation is \$382,091,637, and that the mortgaged indebtedness thereon is \$59,303,326. In other words, more than one-sixth of the entire value of the agricultural lands in these counties is encumbered, and the average encumbrance per acre is \$5.48. The extent of the burden is further revealed in the fact that these counties represent more than one-third of the total value of the property of the State and carry the weight of nearly one-half of the entire mortgaged indebtedness. The statistics are official, and, coming as they do from Republican sources, can not be successfully challenged by Republican partisans.

Their value in relation to this question of farm mortgages is especially significant when we remember that Missouri and Illinois are two of the most prosperous States of the West. If in these great Commonwealths, blessed with their natural affluence of soil, the farmer is driven to the mortgage market, what must be the fate of their less favored sister States? Or, to use the striking figure of Scripture, "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" Sir, in every campaign we hear much of the prosperity and wealth that have come to the nation under this system of taxation, but is it not already apparent that the farmers have not received their just and commensurate proportion?

No class of our citizens is entitled to higher meed of praise than are the farmers for the true and sterling qualities that constitute the glory of American citizenship. They are sober, industrious, enterprising citizens, are not protected by the provisions of any eight-hour law, but with tireless energy from early morn till late at night do they labor with brain and muscle to acquire those resources which alone can give the leisure so essential to mental culture and intellectual growth. If, therefore, we find that the distribution of wealth has gone into other hands, to the detriment of the farmer, it must be conceded that the fault does not lie at the door of this tolling class of our people.

Before passing to a review of the distribution of wealth, I desire for a brief moment to express the gratification I feel in view of the passage of the law which so recently received the approval of this body, a law demanded with almost entire unanimity by the farmers and labor organizations of the country. It provides—

That it shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Census, in addition to the duties now required of him by law, to ascertain the number of persons who live on and cultivate their own farms, and who live in their own homes, and the number who hire their farms and homes, and the number of farms and homes which are under mortgage, the amount of mortgage debt, and the value of the property mortgaged. He shall also ascertain whether such farms and homes have been mortgaged for the whole or part of the purchase-money for the same, or for other purposes, and the rates of interest paid upon mortgage loans.

Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House to state that at the beginning of this session I introduced a bill substantially the same with the law which I have just quoted; and it therefore afforded me peculiar pleasure as a member of the conference committee to unite in the favorable report recommending its passage after having secured the adoption of an amendment making the law effective. An important effect of the law will be the disclosure to the country of the amount of the mortgaged indebtedness of the farmers and thus to place beyond further controversy its vast and alarming aggregate. It will furnish a revelation, sir, of an appalling condition of affairs which, although not due alone to one cause, yet, in my judgment, is in a paramount measure due to the existing system of "protection." I do not by any means ignore the pernicious consequences of a contracted circulation which is so largely due to the hostility of the Republican party towards silver, but the limitations of my subject preclude the indulgence of any amplification of this topic.

THEN AND NOW.

Mr. Chairman, let us now scan the financial horizon and see where the aggregation of wealth is to be found.

Prior to the great civil war the accumulation and distribution of wealth had kept substantial pace with the increase of population, and, as the population like "the star of empire westward took its way," so did the distribution of wealth go hand in hand. Let us make a brief comparison of the condition of the farmer then and now. Then the farmers owned in round numbers one-half of the entire wealth of the United States; in 1880, after two decades of protection, they owned in round numbers but one-fourth of that wealth; and, while laying no claim to gifts of prophecy, I yet venture the prediction that the census of the present year will disclose the fact that although numbering one-

half of the entire population, they own less than one-fifth of the wealth of the Republic.

In 1860, after sixteen years of just and equal laws, the per capita wealth of each citizen of the agricultural States was found to be \$507, while the average per capita in the manufacturing States was \$529; in 1880 the startling disappearance of analogy was revealed in the statement of per capita wealth in the agricultural States of only \$673, while the average in the manufacturing States had swelled to the utterly disproportionate figure of \$1,353; in 1860, after a decade of equal taxation, the average wealth of each farmer had increased from \$171 to \$254, while from 1870 to 1880, under high tariff, the increase of wealth was only from \$231 to \$241 per capita, showing an actual loss of \$13 as compared with 1860.

In other words, the increase of individual wealth among the farmers was eight times as great during low tariff as during high tariff. In 1860, after a decade of low tariff, the increase of the value of agricultural property amounted to \$3,013,149,483, or 6.6 per cent. annually, while from 1860 to 1880 the increase was but \$4,123,538,377, or not quite 2½ per cent. annually.

It is pertinent to observe in this connection that the increase of our population has been at a very rapid ratio, and that this ratio has far exceeded that of the increase of the individual wealth of all classes, the average yearly increase of individual wealth during ten years of low-tariff era having been \$20.60 as against an annual increase of but \$9.10 during the high-tax period from 1870 to 1880.

In 1850 the farmers sold abroad about one hundred and eight millions of agricultural products, which under the laws of reciprocal trade increased to an amount exceeding two hundred and fifty-six millions in ten years, a total increase of one hundred and forty-seven millions, or 136 per cent. in ten years; while in 1880 the increase of the farmers' products sold in foreign markets was only two hundred and seventy-five millions, or but 107 per cent. in twenty-nine years. These figures tell the story of restricted agricultural markets more eloquently than any words of mine could do, however carefully studied or chosen. They proclaim the necessity of the speedy abandonment of the utterly futile policy which attempts to sell in every market of the world and buy in none.

Ten years of low tariff increased the wealth of the agricultural States 163 per cent., while twenty years of high tariff showed an increase of but 127 per cent. Then the population of the agricultural States was, in round numbers, 20,000,000 and the per capita wealth \$507, while in 1880 the population was, in round numbers, 35,000,000 and the average per capita wealth only \$673. Then the West was the almost exclusive owner of its own wealth; now the ownership of Western State and county bonds, Western telegraph lines, Western mining stocks, Western farm mortgages, and Western railroads is to be found in the "industrial States;" then the center of population was substantially the center of wealth; now, although the center of population is but a few miles east of the city of St. Louis, the center of wealth is to be found in the States east of the Alleghenies; then, the farmers were thrifty and prosperous, with a surplus to their credit in bank, while now they are dispirited, discouraged, and under the dominion of low prices and mortgaged indebtedness; then farming was profitable; there were no abandoned farms in Vermont, New Hampshire, and other New England States; neither did mortgages vex the farmers of the West and exhaust their earnings; then there was no enormous aggregation of wealth in the hands of the few, only two or three men among all the population of the United States being reckoned as millionaires, while now, under three decades of protection, wealth has aggregated to colossal proportions in the hands of corporations and individuals, and thousands of our citizens in favored industries can count their wealth by millions, whilst of all this vast number of millionaires not one of them is a farmer.

INEQUALITIES.

Mr. Chairman, I desire for a moment to allude to a feature of the present tariff which most unjustly augments its intrinsic hardships. I refer to the employment of the specific rather than the ad valorem basis for the collection of duties—that is to say, the basis of weight, measure, and number rather than the basis of the intrinsic value of the articles. The effect of a tax upon quantity regardless of value is to increase the cost in the purchases of the poor and diminish the cost in the purchases of the rich. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fiftieth Congress [Mr. MILLS] in a very able report has abundantly illustrated the injustice of the principle in its practical operations under the present tariff, and I shall therefore simply employ a few of his citations:

Hats that cost \$1.68 per pound pay a tax of 60 per cent., while those that cost 32 cents per pound pay 75 per cent. duty; knit goods that cost \$1.78 per pound pay 60 per cent. duty, while those that cost 28 cents per pound pay 70 per cent. duty; woolen cloth of the value of \$1.74 per pound pays 60 per cent. duty, while cloth that costs 60 cents pays 91 per cent. duty.

Mr. Chairman, as great as are the discriminations here presented, their injustice is aggravated under the McKinley bill. I quote a short presentation from the recent report of Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE, who says:

We can not undertake here to point out in detail the numerous increases in the rates of duty on imported goods which this bill proposes to make, but a

few will suffice to show the general character of the measure and the purpose of its authors and supporters. The lowest grades of woolen yarn, worth not over 30 cents per pound, are to be subjected to a duty of 112 per cent., while the most costly yarn will pay 72 per cent. One grade of coarse, cheap blankets will be required to pay 103 per cent., but the finest blankets will pay 72 per cent.

The coarsest and cheapest woolen hats will be subject to a duty of 111 per cent., and the finest to 66 per cent. Women's and children's cheapest dress goods with cotton warp are to be taxed 106 per cent., and the finest 73 per cent. The lowest grade of woolen cloths will pay 125 per cent., and the highest grade 86 per cent. The cheapest qualities of knit goods for underwear range from 112 to 138 per cent., but the finest and most expensive will pay 78 per cent. Woolen shawls of the coarsest and lowest grade, used by the poorest people, will pay 135 per cent. duty and worsted goods of the lowest grade will pay 130 per cent., while the highest grade will pay 90 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without further reference to the ample illustrations of these admirable reports, it does seem that there is in this feature of the tariff a wanton repudiation of the interests of the great masses of our countrymen which entitles it to unmeasured condemnation.

INVENTIVE GENIUS.

I trust, sir, that I may be indulged one further moment in a very brief reference to the absurdity of the attitude in which the most ardent advocates of a protective tariff are at present placed. Their immortal vindication of the system has been the argument that it enabled the manufacturer to pay better prices to his employes, which manifestly under their theory can only be done by enhancing the price of the manufactured product.

When, however, causes to which the tariff is in no wise related have reduced the prices of manufactured commodities they avow this blessing as an additional benefaction of the same tariff, and hence involve themselves in the dilemma upon either horn of which they were most summarily impaled by the unanswerable logic of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] in his memorable address before the House of Representatives May 19, 1888.

John Randolph of Roanoke once used, in reference to a case analogous to this, the convincing metaphor that no man could ride on both sides of a sapling at the same time. And yet, sir, the sagacity which can construct a system of political economy demonstrating how prices can be raised and lowered by the same cause at the same time could give John Randolph's horseman valuable pointers upon experiments far more difficult than the one with the sapling.

Sir, the wonderful discoveries and applications in the use of steam, of machinery, and electricity have alone wrought this benign result. The spirit of invention has brooded upon the troubled waters of human toil until the transformation is the marvel of the age. By the aid of labor-saving machinery 600 hands in the manufacture of agricultural implements now do the work which formerly required about 2,200. In the manufacture of boots and shoes one hand now does the former work of 5. In making carpets one man now accomplishes that which formerly required from 10 to 20.

In spinning one man now achieves the results which formerly demanded between 75 and 100; and in the great industries of cotton and woolen goods, iron, steel, sawed lumber, paper, flour, and grist-mills 517,299 persons now perform the work that formerly required the labor of 15,495,093 persons. Further amplification is unnecessary, and when we remember the additional fact of the practical annihilation of distance and greatly reduced cost of transportation, it follows inevitably that the immense increase of production carries hand in hand its own reduction of prices.

THE REMEDY.

Mr. Chairman, the conclusion of this argument, in so far as it affects the interest of the farmer, may then be concisely formulated into the proposition that the tariff increases the cost to him of almost every article he is compelled to buy and decreases the profits upon every product he is compelled to sell. As a single illustration of its first effect, it may be stated that for the last fiscal year the value of the import trade of this country exceeded seven hundred and forty-five millions, of which amount nearly two hundred and fifty-seven millions consisted of raw materials, entering into our manufactures, and upon which the American manufacturers paid duties amounting to thirty-eight millions.

Now, whilst this very large tax upon raw material is of itself sufficient to drive our manufacturers from any neutral foreign market, for the reason that it so largely enhances the cost of their products, its effects at home are more disastrous to the farmer, increasing as they do the cost to him of his daily garments, of the tools of his handiwork, the fabric of his shelter, and of the very covering of his bed. In this connection it must not be forgotten that all the damage wrought to the farmer is not in the direct and obvious enhancement of price on what he buys, but that in manifest, indirect ways this protective tariff operates to his further detriment.

For example, as is shown in a recent article in *The Forum*, by the able gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE], the tariff on steel rails increased the cost of the construction and operation of railroads from 1871 to 1882, inclusive, to the extent of one hundred and eighty-eight millions. Now, while the railroads made the original payment of this increased price we yet know that at last every dollar so unjustly taken by the steel-rail manufacturers is exacted by the railroads from their customers the farmer being their largest patron. The reduced price

for the farmer's output at the point of shipment or the increased outlay for transportation paid by their agents at the city stock-yards reveal the extent of this indirect tax, which is all the more reprehensible because of the insidious and stealthy methods of its approach.

The remedy, Mr. Chairman, for these primary and patent hardships forced upon our agriculturists is as simple as the duty of the National Government is responsible and serious. Lessen and relieve these hardships, strike the taxes from the articles in daily use among the people, and reduce other tariff burdens, thus cheapening everything the farmer has to buy.

The second injurious effect of the tariff is, as heretofore stated, the restriction of the agricultural market, which materially lessens the profits of the farmer. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this nation is ever to enter upon that larger scope and that broader field and that more commanding position in the business world to which the abilities and energies of our people entitle them, we must speedily reverse our policy in respect to foreign trade.

Indeed, sir, this course offers the only avenue of escape for the farmer from the gloom that now shrouds his pathway. Sir, when I review the marvelous resources of this country and contemplate the genius and enterprise of its people I confess to a sense of humiliation when, under the Republican policy, we stand cowering and halt timorously upon the borders of an arena where the contest for supremacy is being waged by the commercial giants of the world. The United States should enter this arena as fearlessly as did the gladiator in the olden times enter the more tragic arena when all Rome looked down upon him.

What occasion, then, Mr. Chairman, for doubt or dismay? Our resources are essentially superior and infinitely more varied than those of any other nation of the earth, while our people are the intellectual peers of the foremost. We have 6,000 miles of seacoast, one-half of the world's railways, telegraphs, and telephones, all modern inventions and appliances, the most skillful and the most productive labor, the most perfect machinery, with large and ample bodies of capital seeking investments at reasonable rates.

If the Government will but unshackle our genius, unhamper our enterprise, and unfetter our resources we will soon outstrip England and wrest from her the commercial distinction she has won since the policy of exclusion has confined American enterprise to American shores. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sir, with our boasted prowess upon the land, under the ensign of protection we are degraded to an inferior rank upon the high seas. England is to-day the banker and clearing-house for all the nations, and her foreign trade shows the magnificent sum of four billions annually, while the United States lags superfluous behind with less than one and one-half billions, an exhibit inferior in magnitude and value to that of either Germany or France.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party has cut off our trade with the world and entered into partnership with unprofitable business at home. This "Government partnership in trade" must be dissolved; the control of the direction, the volume, and the profits of business enterprise must cease; individual effort and self-reliant business sagacity must be unrestrained, and the ports of the country must be opened wide to the commerce of the globe.

Open the ports and our manufacturers will have a plenteous and profitable foreign market; open the ports and the sunshine of prosperity will illumine every industry; open the ports and trusts will take their flight as fogs before the rising sun; open the ports and articles of necessity will be cheapened and multiplied to our whole people; open the ports and the larger market and demand will give steady employment to labor; open the ports and the drooping energies of the farmer will be revived, and the mortgage no longer encumber and distress him; open the ports and there will be no subsidy to illustrate the fallacious policy of taxing foreign trade to keep it out and at the same time of paying ocean carriers to bring it in; open the ports and all the waters of the multitudinous seas will again be crowded with American ships bearing the products of American skill and American farms under the protectingegis of the old flag of our fathers.

Sir, the scope of the most gifted intellect of our time is utterly inadequate to grasp the ultimate prosperity and grandeur of the American Republic, if we but catch the inspiration which invites to larger fields of endeavor and impels to grander triumphs yet to be achieved. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BURROWS obtained the floor and said: I yield for a moment to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FRANK], who desires to make a statement.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, while I was out of the Chamber, as I learned, the gentleman from Missouri, my colleague [Mr. DOCKERY], took occasion to make this statement, that—

It is notorious and open to all men that the result in the city of St. Louis was largely from contributions of money from protected industries that carried it for the Republican party and elected three Republican members to this House.

I have the honor, Mr. Chairman, to represent the only district lying wholly within the city of St. Louis and I wish to assert as a fact that not one single dollar was contributed from any source to carry the Ninth Congressional district of Missouri. [Applause on the Republican side.] I wish to say also that the result, not only in that district,

but in the Eighth and Tenth districts, lying partly within the city of St. Louis, was due solely to the fact that for the first time in twelve years we had an honest election; for the first time in twelve years we had an unrestrained, a free ballot and an honest count. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope I may be permitted to make a statement—
Mr. BURROWS resumed the floor.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, I will take the first opportunity I can get to reply to the observations of my colleague [Mr. FRANK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, after the able, comprehensive, and exhaustive analysis of the measure now under consideration by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall venture only to make some general observations touching the theories dividing the two great political parties. For after all, Mr. Chairman, it is a theory that confronts us, and not a condition. There can be no condition of the Treasury which legislation can not control. If at any time it is overflowing with a surplus, it is only necessary to diminish the supply to afford the needed relief. If depleted, increased taxation will replenish it. There is nothing, therefore, in the condition which legislation can not easily remedy.

Nor is there any controversy as to the state of the Treasury. It is overflowing with a surplus; and all parties agree that the revenues ought to be reduced to the needs of the Government. The condition of the Treasury conceded, the appropriate remedy to be applied admitted, the only reason why the proper legislative relief has not been and is not promptly invoked is because the two parties can not agree on the theory of taxation. The Republican party would reduce the revenues by one method of taxation and the Democratic party by another; and it is these conflicting theories and these alone that have hitherto prevented the application of any remedy to an acknowledged condition.

It was a theory that prevented tariff legislation in the last Congress. The House was Democratic; the Senate, Republican. Each body passed a tariff bill, the effect of which, it was claimed, would reduce the revenues to the actual needs of the Government; yet both measures failed. The Republican Senate struck from the House bill all after the enacting clause, ingrafted thereon a measure of its own, and returned it to the House of Representatives, where a Democratic House referred it to its Committee on Ways and Means, where it slept the sleep of death. Both of these measures proposed a reduction of taxation in nearly equal degree; yet both failed because they were constructed on opposite theories and neither party would accept the theory of the other.

I therefore repeat, "it is a theory that confronts us, and not a condition." All hope of tariff revision in a Congress where the two Houses were of opposite political faith had therefore to be abandoned; and the only remaining recourse was an appeal to the country by a fresh election to determine the controversy. That appeal was taken. In the campaign of 1888 the two theories so formulated in these measures were presented to the American people, and, after full and exhaustive debate on platform and in the press, a verdict was rendered in favor of the Republican theory of taxation, a verdict so pronounced as to wrest the Executive and the popular branch of Congress from the control of the Democratic party and confer upon the Republican party the whole legislative power of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in the measure we now present we have sought to execute that popular will, thus expressed, to crystallize it into law, and it was hoped that the Democratic party would acquiesce in the verdict of the American people and permit their judgment to be recorded. But in this it seems we are to be disappointed. The Democratic party, as usual, does not propose to conform to the declared will of the people or accept their judgment as final and conclusive. So upon the presentation of this measure we are again confronted with the opposition of the Democratic party, and the conflict of '88 is to be renewed and the theories of the two parties are again submitted to the public, with an appeal to the people for a reversal of their verdict of two years ago.

It is well, therefore, at the outset, before entering upon a consideration of the measure proposed, to come to a clear understanding as to the exact point of difference between the two parties and just what the conflicting theories are which have recently prevented any revision of the tariff whatever.

It should be borne in mind that there is no controversy between the two parties as to the propriety of levying a duty or tax on imports. The founders of the Republic inaugurated the policy of raising revenue for the ordinary expenses of the Government by imposing and collecting a duty or charge upon goods brought into this market for sale from foreign countries; and there has never been a year, nor an hour, from the foundation of the Government to this moment, when these charges have not been imposed and collected, it mattered not what party was in power; and, if the Democratic party, now opposing this measure, should ever again be charged with the administration of public affairs, it would continue to levy a tax on imported goods and rely upon the revenue derived therefrom to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

The parties, therefore, are in accord as to the source from which the needed revenues for the support of the Government should be chiefly derived. Both believe in levying a duty on imported goods. Even the American Free Trade League declares:

We believe in the utmost possible freedom for all citizens of the United States in trade as well as in other relations of life; but we recognize that absolute freedom of trade must be limited by the revenue necessities of the Government, just as absolute freedom in other respects is necessarily limited by Government, and therefore the Free-Trade League willingly submits to taxation and duties to meet the Government necessities.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in his speech yesterday said:

The Democratic party maintains that taxes should be imposed on such articles and at such rates as will bring the required revenue for an honest and economical administration of the Government, producing the least possible restrictions upon importations, the least possible limitations upon exportations, and the least possible interference with the profitable business of the people.

Democrat, revenue-reformer, free-trader, and Republican, all alike believe in imposing duties on imports as a means of defraying governmental expenses.

Nor would there be any serious controversy over the rate of taxation to be imposed if we could agree upon what articles the assessment should be made, for all admit that it should be sufficient to produce the requisite sum to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government, and if there was no other issue than the question of rates the difference between the two parties could be readily adjusted.

The real controversy, primarily, is over the class of imported articles on which duties should be imposed; what articles should come in free and what should be dutiable; and, secondly, the rate of duty the taxed articles should bear. These are the only questions at issue, and their determination involves the conflicting theories of the two parties as to whether duties should be levied for revenue only or for the double purpose of revenue and protection. It is possible to frame two schedules of duties which would produce an equal amount of revenue; yet one would protect American industries and the other utterly destroy them.

The Democratic party declares in favor of a tariff for revenue only, while the Republican party is equally pronounced in favor of a tariff for revenue and protection—not incidental nor accidental, but intentional protection. These are the two irreconcilable theories confronting us, by one or the other of which the tariff problem is to be solved. Here we come, as declared in the views of the minority, "to the parting of the ways."

And now, what does the Democratic party mean by a tariff for "revenue only"? Do you mean that in levying duties you are actuated only by the necessities of the Government, and that if no revenues were needed for the support of the Government you would impose no duty on imports, give the world free access to our markets, and at once open the flood-gates of foreign importation and expose our industrial system to swift and certain destruction? Do you mean that? If not, are we to understand by a tariff for "revenue only" that you would impose and collect duties exclusively on the things we do not produce in this country, such as tea, coffee, and the like, and thereby avoid not only the fact, but even the semblance of protection or encouragement to any domestic industry?

Is that what you mean? If not that, do you mean by a tariff for "revenue only" that in imposing a tax on imports your chief and only concern shall be the necessities of the Government, and so adjust the tax as to secure the most certain and abundant revenue without regard to the effect such imposition might have on American industries and American labor? Is that what you mean? Or are we to understand by a tariff for "revenue only" that, if protection comes to any domestic industry by reason of a duty on imports, it shall come, not as an end, but as an incident?

While it may be difficult to comprehend just what the Democratic party means by a tariff for "revenue only" and while the members of that organization themselves may not be able to arrive at a common understanding as to the exact signification of the term, yet the party, as an organized political power in this country, stands to-day as the avowed antagonist of the doctrine of protection and the acknowledged champion of the principles of free trade.

He who believes in free trade must support the Democratic party, and he who believes in protection must sustain the Republican party, for a tariff for "revenue only," however disguised, is a step towards free trade, and because it is a step in that direction the Republican party opposes it.

The Republican party does not believe in a tariff for "revenue only." We do not believe in imposing a duty on articles of foreign production the like of which are not and can not profitably be produced in this country, but all such products we would admit free of duty, that the purchaser may secure them as cheaply as possible in the markets of the world. Upon this principle we have materially enlarged the free-list in our bill, and if we have failed to place on the free-list a single article of foreign production which is not and can not be produced at home, it is an error which the majority of the committee will be prompt to rectify.

If there is any article on the free-list in this bill the like of which, by fair and adequate protection, could be produced in this country in sufficient quantities to meet the home demand, it is an oversight on the

part of the majority of the committee, and, if it can be pointed out, we will move that it be transferred to the dutiable list and given such protection as will insure its production in this country.

If there is a single article on the dutiable list where the duty is so low as to expose the like domestic industry to a ruinous foreign competition and thus endangers its permanency, it has but to be indicated to secure such measure of protection as will insure its safety.

If the proposed rate of duty on any article on the dutiable list is in excess of what is required to give fair and adequate protection to the competing domestic industry, none will be more ready than the majority of your committee to reduce the rate to the level of such requirement.

Upon this theory the bill is constructed, and we present it to the House and the country, not with the assurance that it is perfect in all its details, but with confidence that its general framework is in harmony with the spirit and policy of the Republican party. It is intended to be a measure of protection from its enacting clause to its closing paragraph. [Applause.] If there is a single provision in it which in its practical working will inure to the benefit of any foreign industry to the detriment of our own, I say frankly that such provision is there by inadvertence, and not by intention. [Applause.] If there is a section in this bill which will bring disaster to any American industry or paralyze the arm of a single laboring man in the United States, such section is there by accident, and not by design. [Applause.]

Mr. GEAR. And we will strike it out.

Mr. BURROWS. The entire bill is framed expressly with a view of admitting free of duty all articles the like of which are not and can not be produced in this country and imposing duties on the articles we do produce, with the double purpose of securing sufficient revenue for the support of the Government, while, at the same time, fostering and diversifying American industries, giving investment to American capital and employment to American labor.

But nothing can more forcibly illustrate the two theories thus outlined than a comparison of some of the provisions of the measure we propose with those of the Mills bill, so called, which is the accepted embodiment of the doctrine of the Democratic party on the tariff question.

The two measures fully illustrate the two conflicting, irreconcilable theories. At the hazard of repeating what my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] has said touching an important provision of this bill I will take as an illustration the article of tin-plate. The present duty is 1 cent a pound. The Mills bill proposed to remove that duty and place tin-plate on the free-list. We propose, on the contrary, not only not to make it free, but to increase the duty to at least 2 cents a pound, with a view of establishing the industry in the United States.

Nothing can more strikingly exemplify the Republican doctrine of protection and the Democratic theory of free trade than the proposed legislation by the two parties touching this industry.

It is conceded that we are not producing a pound of tin-plate in the United States, and the Democratic party would so legislate as to make its production here an impossibility for all time to come, and thus not only continue our dependence on a foreign country for a supply of this article of prime necessity, but make our thralldom complete and perpetual.

We propose, on the contrary, by a guaranty of ample protection, to invite American capital to enter a new field of investment and lay the foundations for the production of our own tin-plate; and instead of importing this product we would import and establish the industry itself, and so, not only furnish increased employment for American labor, keep the millions at home now annually spent abroad, but ultimately reduce the price to the American consumer of every pound of tin-plate entering into our consumption, both foreign and domestic. [Applause.]

Note how this industry was hampered in the beginning and ultimately destroyed in the United States. By a ruling of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1864 an intended protection of 2½ cents a pound was reduced to 15 per cent. ad valorem, by which it became impossible for us to compete with the cheaper foreign product. The effect of this decision was not only to shut down the domestic mills, but to deter capital from all venture in this industry. The foreign manufacturer was quick to avail himself of our folly, and, believing himself secure against any competition in the United States and hoping and believing we had abandoned all thought of ever producing our own tin-plate, in 1873 advanced the price of tin-plate to \$12 a box, at which price it sold in the American markets.

Influenced by this exorbitant price of foreign tin-plate, our mills were again set in motion in 1873, and continued in operation until 1876, when the price of tin-plate had fallen from \$12 to \$4.50, to so low a point that the American makers could not survive and pay American wages; and so, in 1876, we were forced to close the last American mill. No sooner had the English manufacturer driven us out of business and thus destroyed all competition than he again advanced the price of tin-plate to \$9 and \$10, confident that he had absolutely secured the American market. But in 1879, under the stimulus of high prices, the American mills were again opened; but they were no sooner in full

operation than the price again began to decline under a flood of foreign importations and fell from \$10 to \$4 a box.

Then it was that the foreign manufacturer determined to strike a final and death blow to this industry in the United States, and to that end agents of the American mills were followed by the representatives of the English mills, who announced to American customers that, no matter what the American product was offered for, they would sell for 25 cents cheaper, and by this method they were enabled to utterly destroy the American manufacture and silence the last tin-plate mill in the United States. Master of the situation, the foreign manufacturer again advanced the price of tin-plate to \$7 a box.

This disastrous result was accomplished under the operation of a tariff for "revenue only" and demonstrates how futile it is for the American manufacturer under an inadequate duty to contend against the merciless competition of a foreign rival.

The foreign representative of this industry had not forgotten the instruction of Lord Brougham in the English Parliament when he said, "The English manufacturer can well afford to sell his product in the American market at a loss for awhile, that he may thereby stifle American industries in their cradle." So this industry in the United States was, by this simple process, stifled and utterly destroyed, and, as I said before, to-day we are not producing a single pound of tin-plate in the United States.

Now, see how this suicidal policy has advantaged our foreign rival. While our last mill has been closed, we have been paying tribute to the foreign manufacturers, and the English mills have doubled and America has become her most profitable market.

In 1864 England sold us only 73,206,384 pounds of tin-plate, for which we paid only \$4,197,706, while in 1889 she sold us 742,136,640 pounds, for which we paid the princely sum of \$21,726,707. To-day we consume more tin-plate than all the rest of the world.

In 1887 Great Britain exported 6,207,388 boxes, 4,526,367 of which were sold in the American market to the American people.

In the last twenty-five years we have bought of England 7,835,501,792 pounds of tin-plate, for which we have paid her, exclusive of duty and freight, the enormous sum of \$320,037,362.

This has been the bitter fruit of a tariff for "revenue only," and it is to a perpetual feast of this kind the free-trade Democracy invites us.

Every pound of this tin-plate might have been produced in the United States, every dollar of those three hundred and twenty millions might have been retained among our own people instead of sending them abroad to support English labor and reward English capital.

I would not venture to calculate the advantage which would have come to us as a people if during those years this great industry had been American instead of English, giving investment to American capital and employment to American labor.

But in 1888 the National Association of Steel Workers made a careful computation of the direct benefits for a single year which would follow the establishment and maintenance of this industry in the United States, and on the basis of the importations for 1887 they find that to produce in the United States what that year we imported would have required an additional consumption of 1,000,000 tons of iron ore, 300,000 tons of limestone, 2,000,000 tons of coal and coke, 400,000 tons of pig-iron, 5,500,000 pounds of lead, 13,000,000 pounds of tallow and oil, 40,000,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, 12,000,000 feet of lumber, and would have given direct employment to 35,000 work-people, to whom would have been paid in wages \$23,000,000.

All this in a single year.

These are some of the direct benefits which would flow from the establishment of this industry in the United States, while the indirect advantages to all the people can not possibly be conceived.

But it will be said by our opponents that no amount of protection will enable us to supply our home demand for the reason that we are without the necessary raw material. True our tin mines are not yet fully developed, but that they promise an abundant and sufficient yield can not be questioned.

But, whether in the beginning we can furnish our own raw material or not, that is no reason why we should not manufacture our own tin-plate. England does not produce sufficient raw material for her industry. In 1887 England imported nearly 26,000 tons of tin to be used in the manufacture of tin-plate, while producing at home but a trifle over 9,000 tons. The raw tin is free, and if our home supply falls short of the required demand, we can import from abroad as well as England.

No valid reason can be furnished for continuing our dependence upon a foreign country for the supply of this article of prime necessity in every household. No reason can be assigned why we should continue to pay tribute to England, as we did last year, at the rate of \$22,000,000 annually, to be continued in ever-increasing exactions.

This proposition to increase the duty on tin-plate will undoubtedly provoke the severest criticism of the Democratic party. This is to be anticipated. It is in conflict with its theories of "free trade." It would never occur to modern revenue reformers to build up a new industry in the United States by the imposition of a protective duty on the competing foreign article. They much prefer a tariff for "revenue only," and when under such a duty the domestic industry languishes,

instead of throwing over it the shield of governmental protection, they would expose and abandon it to the assaults of a merciless foreign competition, to which it must inevitably succumb.

We are determined that this disgraceful surrender shall not be consummated. We can make our own tin-plate. We have the material, the capital, the labor, the skill, the genius, and under this bill, when enacted into law, a new industry will spring into life, bringing to the American people a renewed source of wealth and to labor increased employment. [Applause.]

This single example and the course of action proposed by the two parties touching this industry fully exemplify the irreconcilable differences between the adherents of protection and free trade.

Other instances might be cited. You would put hemp and flax, the basis of the linen industry, on the free-list (as was proposed in the Mills bill) and abandon all thought and effort to ever produce the raw material in this country, and make perpetual the annual tribute we now pay of over \$25,000,000 to the foreign producer of our linen goods. We propose, on the contrary, to establish and promote the culture of American fiber for our linen fabrics, and so open to the farmer a new field of profitable husbandry.

You would put wool on the free-list and expose our wool-growers to a ruinous competition with the cheap-grown wools of Australia and South America, which would surely result in driving our flocks to the slaughter-pen and our flock-masters into bankruptcy and reduce the people of this great nation to perpetual dependence on foreign countries for the very clothing on their backs. We propose additional protection, increased safeguards to this great industry, and would foster and encourage it to the fullest possibilities of its development until we possess within ourselves the capacity to supply our own people with this article of prime necessity for their comfort and happiness. [Applause.]

What a spectacle you present! To what national dependence and degradation you would reduce us! You ask 60,000,000 of people to stand up shivering, unless clothed with foreign wools, and drink the health and prosperity of English capital and English labor out of English cups. [Applause.]

But examples need not be multiplied. From the proposed action of the two parties touching the industries I have mentioned, tin-plate, flax, hemp, and wool, it will be observed how widely separate the two parties are and how irreconcilable their views. There is no room for compromise. There is here no middle ground. It is protection or free trade, pure and simple, and no mask can disguise it.

But the opponents of this measure criticize us not only for protecting the articles they would admit free of duty, but because we do not propose a general reduction of duties all along the line to what they may be pleased to regard a revenue basis. They seem to be laboring under the delusion that in order to reduce the revenues it is only necessary to lower the rate of duty on imports. Nothing could be more fallacious.

It is a most delicate matter to so adjust the duty on imports as to secure equitable results to all. Some one has said that "our tariff system is like a spider's web; touch a single thread of it and the whole fabric trembles." Our industries are so interwoven and interdependent that a modification of the rates in a single particular would be felt throughout the entire system.

It is a difficult matter to so adjust duties as to secure revenue and at the same time adequately protect the domestic industry. If the duty is too high, it is prohibition, with no revenue to the Government and danger of monopoly at home. If the duty is too low, importations will flow in in such abundance as not only to increase the revenue, but to endanger and ultimately destroy the domestic industry. Hence I say it is a difficult matter to so arrange the schedule of rates that, while securing revenue from importations, we shall at the same time give to the home producer at least an equal chance in his own market.

The folly of attempting to reduce the revenues by an inconsiderate reduction of the rate of duty and the disastrous consequences flowing from such a step are fully exemplified in the tariff act of 1883, when the duty on window-glass was reduced only one-eighth of a cent a pound. Following that reduction the importations were largely increased, and the revenues derived from this source for the succeeding four years were \$1,250,000 greater than for the four years immediately preceding, resulting in lessening American production and reducing American wages.

We have not, therefore, in this bill revised the tariff by reducing the rate of duties when such reduction would, in our judgment, have the effect only to increase the importations, enlarge the revenues, deprive labor of employment, and endanger the permanency and prosperity of American industries. On the contrary, when in our judgment, based on a thorough and exhaustive examination, rates could be reduced, we have not hesitated to make the reduction, keeping steadily in view, not the question of "revenue only," but the other and more important consideration: the security of the American market to the American producer.

Upon this principle we have lowered the duty on steel rails from \$17 to \$13.44 a ton and reduced the rates on one hundred and fifty other articles, running through every schedule and embracing almost every industry. In this connection it is worthy of note that we have re-

lieved every household in the land from the unjust burden of \$56,000,000 borne by all the people by making sugar free. The duty imposed on this article of prime necessity was a direct tax on the consumer by reason of our inability to produce a sufficient quantity at home to become a competing factor in our own market.

While doing this we have cared for the domestic producer by a liberal bounty, which, while protecting our cane-fields, will, it is hoped, so stimulate the beet industry in the United States, as it has in France and Germany, as to ultimately insure a domestic supply of sugar equal to the home demand.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] said yesterday, referring to this proposition:

I say it is an infamous measure that proposes to give a bounty to any class of people, and I say, without any hesitation in the world, that it is a measure that startles the whole world with its audacity.

And then, in language more forcible than elegant, he exclaims:

You compel him to pay tribute in every direction. You ram your hands into his pockets up to the shoulder and take \$7,000,000 and give it as a bounty to somebody to raise sugar.

I said, Mr. Chairman, that this duty on sugar is a revenue duty. We do not produce one-eighth of our consumption. Louisiana is producing less sugar to-day than in 1853, and because we do not compete to any appreciable extent in this industry every dollar and every penny of duty you levy on the foreign product is a direct tax upon every consumer of sugar in the United States.

It is a revenue duty, and in 1889 we levied and collected a duty of \$55,975,610 upon the foreign product, and this duty not only advanced by so much the price of the foreign product, but of the domestic product as well, and yet you compel the consumers of sugar in the United States to pay \$64,000,000 burden to sustain this one industry which we propose to protect with equal efficacy by the payment of \$7,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Texas proposes that we shall continue this unjust taxation. They propose not only to have "one hand" in the pockets of the American people, but both, and take from their pockets \$64,000,000 to protect an industry which under the system we propose will require the expenditure of only \$7,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

By this policy we will save to the people of this country \$57,000,000 of this annual charge. This is the proposition "that startles the world."

Mr. Chairman, Alexander Hamilton did not seem to be "startled" by it when in his famous report to Congress in 1791, touching the means to be employed in promoting domestic manufactures, he said:

The bounty is a species of encouragement more positive and direct than any other, and for that very reason has a more immediate tendency to stimulate and uphold new enterprises, increasing the chances of profit and diminishing the risks of loss in the first attempts. Bounties are sometimes not only the best, but the only proper expedient for uniting the encouragement of a new object of agriculture with that of a new object of manufacture.

There is a degree of prejudice against bounties, from an appearance of giving away the public money without an immediate consideration and from a supposition that they serve to enrich particular classes at the expense of the community. But neither of these sources of dislike will bear a serious examination. There is no purpose to which public money can be more beneficially applied than to the acquisition of a new and useful branch of industry; no consideration more valuable than a permanent addition to the general stock of productive labor.

As to the second source of objection, it equally lies against other modes of encouragement which are admitted to be eligible. As often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price, it causes an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer. A bounty does no more. But it is the interest of the society, in each case, to submit to a temporary expense, which is more than compensated by an increase of industry and wealth, by an augmentation of resources and independence, and by the circumstances of eventual cheapness.—Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, Report of Manufactures, December 5, 1791.

But this measure will be criticised by our opponents, not only for transferring to the protected list articles which they would admit free of duty, as also on account of its failure to reduce existing rates in conformity with their notions of a tariff for "revenue only;" but it will be specially obnoxious to them, as in some instances an increase is proposed over existing rates.

To the modern revenue reformer this is the very "front of our offending," and there will be no end of declamation about increased war taxes, enormous percentages, and fabulous burdens, which would surely alarm and deceive a people less intelligent than our own.

That we have increased rates in some instances is true. Whenever we have found an established American industry suffering from foreign competition to such an extent as to endanger its permanency and threaten its destruction, we have not hesitated to give it such additional protection as will insure its maintenance and prosperity.

In this connection I am frank to say that in making these increases we have not been actuated so much by a desire to avoid large percentages as by that higher consideration, the necessities of American industries and American labor. When, therefore, we have found a domestic manufacturer being driven from his own market by a remorseless foreign competition, we have not hesitated to interpose just such governmental protection as will insure to the American producer an equal chance, at least, in his own market.

If it is charged, as it undoubtedly will be, that the increases have been made in some instances in the cheaper class of goods used by the

common people, our answer is that it is here not infrequently that foreign competition is most severely felt, our foreign rivals with cheaper and sometimes convict labor being able to drive our manufacturers in this class of goods from the market, and this, too, without any resulting benefit to the consumer. As an instance, take the case of pocket cutlery: The German manufacturer will make this knife [exhibiting sample], put it in our market duty paid at 30 cents a dozen less than it can possibly be manufactured for in this country, and so drive us, as they have done, entirely out of the manufacture of this class of goods. By this means a double injury is inflicted on our people: first, the American industry is crippled and destroyed and, second, the people are swindled in the purchase of worthless cutlery at a price for which they might have secured good American knives.

Here is a knife of American manufacture, which can be made in this country for 60 cents a dozen and sold by the retail merchant at 10 cents apiece, or \$1.20 a dozen, making a profit of 100 per cent. The German knife sells at retail at the same price; but no merchant will buy this American knife and content himself with a profit of 100 per cent. when he can purchase the German knife at 30 cents and make 300 per cent. So the home industry is destroyed. [Applause.]

So it will be found in many instances where we have increased rates on the class of goods used by the masses of the people that the only effect will be to secure the manufacture of such goods at home, give employment to American labor, and furnish to the consumer a better article at the same if not diminished cost.

But in addition to the specific criticisms of the various provisions of this measure we shall be confronted with the usual objections to the whole theory upon which it is framed and there will be no end of denunciation of the protective system as a whole, and all the ills flesh is heir to will be charged to this policy.

First, it will be reasserted with increased emphasis that the imposition of a duty on imports is a tax paid by the consumer and that the effect of such imposition is not only to raise the price of the foreign article, but to advance the price of the domestic article in an equal degree. While this is true of a strictly revenue tariff raised on articles not produced in this country, yet it is not true when the duty is levied on articles the like of which are manufactured at home in sufficient quantities to meet the home demand.

A century ago Alexander Hamilton so completely exposed the fallacy of such an assumption that I venture to remind gentlemen of his declaration in this regard. He said:

But, though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of a tariff was to increase the price, it is universally true that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection and has engaged in the prosecution of it a competent number of persons, it can be afforded and accordingly seldom or never fails to be sold cheaper in process of time than the foreign article for which it is a substitute. The internal competition which takes place soon does away with anything like monopoly and by degrees reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed.

How completely the history of our industrial development exemplifies the truth of Hamilton's assertion and refutes the oft-repeated dogma of the free-trader that the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer.

Without entering into particulars I challenge any man to name a single article on which a duty is imposed, under which the production of such article has grown to the extent, or nearly so, of the home demand, that the price of such article, if competition is not interfered with, has not been materially reduced to the consumer. This results from the inexorable law of supply and demand. If the article is exclusively of foreign production the American consumer is entirely at the mercy of the foreign producer, who can impose just such price as he pleases, restricted only by foreign competition, which, when necessary, can by combines be easily controlled.

But when by a protective tariff the industry is established at home and the supply of such article increased commensurate with the demand of the home market, then the price of such article, both foreign and domestic, will inevitably be reduced to the lowest possible point; and yet our free-trade friends will never tire of asserting that the tariff is a tax paid by the consumer, that we are taxing the many for the benefit of the few. In many instances the exact converse of this proposition is true: we tax the few for the benefit of the many.

I have no time to go through the catalogue of our industries from steel rails to every article in the stock of the hardware merchant in confirmation of this assertion.

There are many instances where we purchase the domestic article for less than the duty; and how can it be said in such case that its cost is enhanced by the amount of such duty?

But in this connection it will be charged, not only on this floor, but in the approaching campaign, that our proposed duty on tin-plate is a tax on the laboring man's dinner-pail. Admitting this to be true in the first instance, let us see the exact weight of this burden.

Here is an ordinary pail [exhibiting sample] such as is used by workmen, containing a coffee receptacle and a tin cup. This whole outfit cost at retail in Philadelphia just 35 cents. Removing the wire handle the weight of the remainder is just 18½ ounces; allowing one-half ounce for wire and solder used in its manufacture and we have 18 ounces or 1½ pounds of tin-plate in this dinner-pail. Now assuming that the present duty of 1 cent a pound on tin-plate is included in the

price (35 cents), the 18 ounces of tin-plate used in the manufacture of this pail would represent exactly 1½ cents. If the duty were now to be doubled and the cost of tin-plate should be increased correspondingly and this increased duty should be added to the price of the dinner-pail, it would cost the workman 36½ cents instead of the 35 cents he now pays. One and one-eighth cents is therefore the full measure of the additional burden he would be called upon to bear, as a compensation for the establishment of a great industry in the United States, which would give employment to 35,000 of his fellow-workmen, whose annual wage earnings would be \$23,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

All this it will be understood is upon the assumption that the actual duty would be added to the price. But who is so credulous as to believe that the price of a dinner-pail would be increased by the trifling amount 1½ cents, or who so blind as not to understand that the establishment of this industry in the United States will, in the end, result in lower prices for tin goods to all the people?

But it will be charged that this duty will enhance the cost of canned goods to the consumer. Here is an ordinary 3-pound tomato can [exhibiting can] which, after removing contents, weighs exactly 6½ ounces. Allowing one-quarter of an ounce for the solder used in its manufacture we have exactly 6 ounces of tin-plate in the can and its lid. The price of these tins at wholesale is at the outside \$2.50 a hundred, or 2½ cents apiece. Now, assuming that the present duty of 1 cent a pound is included in the price of this can, the price of this can to the packer is enhanced just three-eighths of a cent. This can and its contents were purchased at retail in Philadelphia for 8 cents. If we double the duty as proposed and the whole duty should be added to the cost the consumer would be required to pay 8½ cents for this can of goods. Is it to be presumed that this additional duty would fall upon the consumer? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that it would be shared by the manufacturer, packer, jobber, and retailer? But in this case as in the other it would not be long before the price, by reason of domestic competition, would be reduced below what it is to-day.

But suppose the duty does in some instances increase the price of the article to the consumer, shall we therefore abandon the policy of protection, throw down every barrier, and invite foreign manufacturers to take possession of our market because, forsooth, it will bring to our people cheaper products? Is it a mere question of cheapness. Cheap clothing, cheap wages, cheap food, cheap homes, cheap men? Are there no higher considerations?

Sir Edward Sullivan, an English baronet, living under and realizing the baneful influence of free trade, tersely and forcibly says:

After forty years' experience of one-sided free trade, the condition of labor in the United Kingdom is very alarming, many industries have died out or removed to other countries; in nearly every industry English labor is undersold by foreign labor; in most industries four days is now considered a week's work.

Employment, not cheapness, is the mainspring of national prosperity and contentment. The way to make a nation happy and prosperous is to give everybody an opportunity of being employed. The idea of supplying a population of 34,000,000 with everything at a lower price than they can produce it is probably the most preposterous nonsense that ever entered the human mind.

This is actually what free trade pretends to do; we are attempting to supply ourselves with everything cheaper than we can produce it. In other words, we place before our workers cheap food, but put it out of their power to earn the money to buy it.

Free trade means untaxed foreign competition. Foreign competition means competition in cheapness; competition in cheapness means competition in cheap labor; competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood; and competition in flesh and blood is slavery. Excessive competition is the greatest curse that can be imposed on a working community. The unrestricted competition of the whole world is rapidly making the condition of English labor intolerable.

Cheap clothing and cheap food are of no value if human labor is cheaper still. Excessive cheapness is of no value to the community without employment. Employment means cheapness. Those who have employment can buy. Those who have not employment can not buy. * * * Free trade means cheapness to the rich, the idlers, those with fixed incomes, but longer hours, lower wages, harder work to the workers. The workers are twenty to one to the idlers, and therefore free trade sacrifices the interests of nineteen to the interests of the one.

Five shillings spent on the produce of English labor benefits the working class more than 50 shillings spent on the produce of foreign labor. Internal production and internal consumption are the only proofs of national prosperity. The first and paramount duty of every Government is to encourage conditions under which every one can find employment.

Into this race for cheapness the Republican party does not propose to enter.

Again, it has been said and will be repeated that the protective system tends to produce unnatural conditions, overproductions, and consequent trusts and combines, to the destruction of healthy competition and the detriment of the people. Suppose that to be true, is that any reason why the system itself should be abandoned? There are numerous evils growing out of a free Government, but is that any reason why such a Government should be demolished and a despotism erected on its ruins? Statesmanship dictates, rather, correction of these evils while maintaining the Government.

We have already passed a measure aimed at these trusts and combines which, it is hoped, will uproot and destroy the last vestige of their tyrannical power.

I have no apology to offer for the men who seek to deprive the people of the benefit of fair prices, which unrestrained domestic competition insures. When an industry in the United States has been built up under the fostering care of the Government and then the beneficiaries thereof, feeling the effect of domestic competition, combine to prevent

the resultant benefits to the people, I would say to all such, if you will not permit free and unrestrained competition at home, you shall encounter the competition of the world. [Applause.]

It would be well, however, to remember in this connection that trusts are not confined to protected countries or to protected industries.

But it is frequently asserted by our opponents that our protective policy cripples foreign commerce and will ultimately destroy it. Gentlemen who make this declaration must forget for the moment, in their enthusiasm for free trade, that in 1860, at the close of the last period of a low-revenue tariff, our total exports were only \$336,576,057, while in 1889 they were \$742,401,375, an increase of more than \$400,000,000. They forget or fail to recall the fact that our entire foreign trade in 1860 was only \$637,192,176, while in 1880, only twenty years later, it had more than doubled, and aggregated the princely sum of \$1,503,593,404. Why, the total value of our export trade from 1789 to 1860 was only \$9,000,000,000, while from 1860 to 1889 it was \$15,000,000,000, greater by \$6,000,000,000 during the twenty-nine years of protection than during the whole previous history of the Government.

More than this. Our trade during this protective period has been to our advantage, and not to our detriment. From 1846 to 1872 there was an excess of imports over exports. The first fifteen years of this period were those of a low tariff and a consequent prostration of domestic manufactures. The years of the war required large imports and the period of inflation following kept the balance of trade against us. From 1874, however, until the present time there have been only three years when the balance of trade has been against us.

From 1846 to 1873 the net balance of trade against us was \$1,525,240,844, while from 1874 to 1889 our exports exceeded our imports by \$1,581,240,844. In the face of these facts it is astounding that gentlemen will have the effrontery to affirm that our protective system is injurious to our foreign trade.

It may be well to bear in mind in this connection that while our foreign commerce has steadily increased our annual domestic trade has reached the fabulous sum of more than \$40,000,000,000.

But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] says:

To check importations is to check exportations. When we refuse to take from the European countries, South America, or from the East or West India Islands, or from any other spot on the globe, that which they offer to give to us in exchange for our products the same interdiction which you make against the importation of their products is an interdiction against the exportation of our own.

Just in proportion as you remove the restrictions and permit the importation of their products, just so far do you remove the barriers in the way of exportation of our own.

Let us see what foundation there is for this statement and what basis of fact it has to rest on.

I think we shall find, upon examination of the books, that such a statement is wholly fallacious. As if any nation on the face of the earth because we trade with them will therefore trade with us! Nations are like individuals; they trade where it is for their advantage. I have here a tabular statement of our commerce with the South American countries. There was admitted into the United States from those countries last year, 1889, \$120,560,325 worth of products, all of which but \$14,738,187 came in free of duty, as the following table shows:

1889.	Total imports into United States.	Dutiable.
Haiti.....	\$3,757,443	\$5,774
Nicaragua.....	1,747,246	250
Peru.....	314,082	6,271
Guatemala.....	2,346,685	49,526
Uruguay.....	2,986,964	836,094
Colombia.....	4,263,519	37,600
Argentine Republic.....	5,454,618	1,320,212
Costa Rica.....	1,442,365	519
Brazil.....	60,403,804	4,935,328
Honduras.....	1,215,561	4,958
Mexico.....	21,253,601	7,428,359
Bolivia.....	2,126	23
Venezuela.....	10,392,569	6,800
Chili.....	2,622,625	73,864
Salvador.....	1,662,162	26,696
Ecuador.....	695,005	917
Total.....	120,560,325	14,738,187

But, notwithstanding our large imports from the South American countries and the further fact that 88 per cent. were admitted free, yet the bulk of their trade was with the countries of Europe.

In 1888 we took of South America \$84,000,000 worth, and she purchased of us \$29,000,000. Brazil sold us \$65,000,000 worth and bought in the markets of the world \$100,000,000 worth, of which she accommodated us with 8 per cent. ! We give her the benefit of free coffee in our markets and she turns around and trades with England which imposes a duty on coffee.

Again, the gentleman from Texas says if we would only trade with nations and take down our barriers they would trade with us.

We took of Mexico in 1886 \$10,000,000 worth of products; she bought from us \$7,000,000 worth. We received from Brazil \$41,000,000; she

took of us \$6,000,000. We bought of Central America \$5,000,000 worth, and they bought of us \$2,000,000 worth. We took of Venezuela \$5,791,000; she bought of us \$2,732,000. Uruguay sold us \$4,925,000; she bought of us \$1,221,000. Cuba sold us \$51,000,000 and bought of us \$10,000,000.

But let us see how the balance stands in our trade with European nations and what indication there is that we are to suffer in our trade relations unless this free-trade theory is adopted. England sold us in 1886 \$131,404,194 worth of products and bought from us \$301,286,970. Scotland sold us \$14,271,971 and bought of us \$28,605,436. Ireland sold us \$3,577,889 and bought of us \$18,561,294. Belgium sold us \$9,178,513 and bought of us \$23,294,395. Portugal sold us \$1,344,167 and bought of us \$4,476,123. Northern Russia sold us \$2,014,231 and bought of us \$7,451,448. Spain sold us \$5,930,202 and bought of us \$13,091,950. These figures would seem to contradict the theories of the gentleman from Texas that nations will not trade with us by reason of the restrictions of our tariff.

But finally it will be charged that the present depressed condition of agriculture in this country is due in no small degree, if not chiefly, to our protective policy. That such depression exists there can be no question; but that it is attributable in the remotest degree or that it is the result of such a system is without the shadow of foundation. This depression is not confined to our people, but is general, and in some countries more severe than in our own.

Italy appoints a commission to inquire into the depressed condition of agriculture; France and Germany are suffering more or less from like conditions; while in free-trade England such depression has been severe and protracted, reducing rents and land values, destroying capital and tenant farming, bankrupting many and driving others to emigration.

Since the inauguration of the era of free trade in England the farming class has been reduced from 25 per cent. to 12 per cent. of the entire population.

While opinion may differ as to the exact cause of our agricultural depression, no one will be so venturesome as to ascribe it to a policy which has diversified our industries and created a home market capacious enough to absorb, exclusive of cotton and tobacco, 95 per cent. of all the products of the farm, aggregating annually more than \$3,000,000,000.

Of the importance and value of a home market for agriculture, permit me to again invoke the judgment of Hamilton:

This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first consequence.

It is of all things that which must effectually conduce to a flourishing state of agriculture. To secure such a market there is no other expedient than to promote manufacturing establishments. Manufacturers, who constitute the most numerous class, after the cultivators of the land, are for that reason the principal consumers of the surplus of their labor.

If our free-trade friends are deaf to the counsels of Hamilton, possibly they will listen to the admonitions of Adam Smith as he descants on the advantages of the home market. Hear him, the apostle of free trade:

The capital employed in purchasing in one part of a country in order to sell in another part the product of the industry of that country, generally replaces by such operation two distinct capitals that had both been employed in its agriculture or manufactures, and thus enables them to continue that employment. The capital used in buying foreign goods for domestic consumption, when the purchase is made by the produce of domestic industry, replaces also two distinct capitals, but one of them only supports domestic industry, the other supports foreign industry; and therefore foreign trade will give but one-half the encouragement to the industry or the productive labor of a country that domestic or internal trade does.

Of what value to the American farmer are the markets of the world in comparison with his home market? How much of the farmer's surplus products does the world's market require to-day? Before dropping the substance for the shadow it would be well to inquire into the extent of the foreign demand for the products of our farms.

If a policy is adopted which destroys the home market and forces the American farmer into the markets of the world, when his vessels are laden with the products of his farm to what ports on the inhabitable globe will he direct his course? Not to South America nor Asia nor Africa nor Australasia nor the islands of the sea; for in all these there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and there is no prospect that there ever will be, for these countries are abundantly supplied with agricultural laborers and surplus lands. Europe is the only country which does not feed its own people; and even there, Russia, Germany, Turkey, Roumania, Servia, and Hungary produce their own food supply and, excluding Germany, furnish a surplus for the European markets.

Outside of Great Britain, therefore, there is practically no demand for our agricultural products; and with the rich fields of India open to her it is not difficult to discern that the time is not far distant when even this demand will cease.

Can it be possible that the farmers of this country can be induced to co-operate with the party of free trade and so cripple and destroy our manufacturing industries and thus deprive themselves of the very market which is their chief dependence? Will it better conditions to drive the men now engaged in manufacturing, and who are the consumers of the farmer's surplus, out of the factory on to the farm to become his rival and add to the enormous volume of the products of the soil?

Will the farmer, in a desire for relief from a temporary depression, invite a condition of things which will be permanently disastrous?

If by a reversal of our policy the home market is destroyed, where on the face of the earth will the farmer turn to dispose of his surplus products?

The Hon. J. R. Dodge, the accomplished statistician of the Agricultural Department, speaking of the present depression and the worthlessness of the foreign market, says:

We can not force foreigners to buy our bread. There has been a mass of ineffable nonsense regarding "the markets of the world" for wheat. Less than a fourth of the people of the world eat wheat. Half of the people of Europe scarcely know its taste, while few of the nations of Asia and Africa have any knowledge of it. South America is now no market for flour, as more wheat is grown there than is required for domestic consumption, and an annually enlarging outlet for wheat is now sought in the distribution of the surplus. Australasia makes more than a home supply. India has a surplus of 10 to 15 per cent.

Eastern Europe always has wheat to sell, leaving only Western Europe to supplement its nearly full garner with the contributions of all other countries, those of Europe included. Of the average 4 bushels consumed by each inhabitant of Europe, only a half bushel comes from other continents, and this is practically the measure of the market for the wheat surplus of the world, a market which neither reciprocity nor the persuasion of any international comity can enlarge; nothing but war, famine, or pestilence, nothing but an act of God or a change of crop distribution utterly at variance with long-settled policy and practical sense, can swell to sudden importance the demand for wheat and flour that will relieve prevailing stagnation and advance prices.

It is futile to attempt to defy the law of supply and demand. So long as farmers insist on growing only the bread grains, cotton, tobacco, and cattle, and to neglect other products which are needed, which we import at a cost of more than \$200,000,000 annually, just so long will the lamentation over low prices continue. Diversification is essential to agricultural salvation. There are writers and speakers who are doing incalculable injury by their influence in repression of any tendency to a wider range of rural production, encouraging idleness and idleness, paralyzing enterprise, fatalizing rural inertia, and encouraging dependence on foreign production and the draining of the resources of the country to foreign lands. They appear to deprecate any effort towards independence or the cultivation of self-reliance, the stimulation of invention, the acquisition of manual skill, or the development of rural taste. Their advice points in the direction of aimless poverty and practical serfdom.

But the gentleman from Texas says:

We have gone on to develop the branches of our industry until we can to-day produce in our manufactories in nine months all that our people can consume in a year, until we can produce 15 per cent. more of agricultural products than all our people can consume.

"Now, the question before you," he says, "is what are we to do about that? You have got a home market. You have sold every dollar of your manufactures you can sell in the home market, and every dollar's worth of agricultural products you can sell, and yet you have a surplus on hand, and it is increasing just in proportion to the increase of population. Now, what do you propose to do?" Then, he says, "The Democratic party is going to let down the bars" and let these goods go to every people who want them, and take from those other people what they do not want. "Let down the bars!" What is to hinder the surplus now from going abroad? There is no export duty. But to "let down the bars" will swell our surplus at home and incalculably aggravate our condition.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried the experiment of "letting down the bars." The "bars were down" during our entire colonial history, and England made us "hewers of wood and drawers of water," discouraging and sometimes preventing a diversification of our industries. A manufacturing establishment in South Carolina was, by act of Parliament, declared a public nuisance and abated, and an English statesman declared that we should not even make a hob nail in this country; and so the people of these colonies were dependent upon foreign countries, chiefly England, for their supply of not only the luxuries, but even their commonest necessities of life, and it was because of this condition of things more than anything else that the War of Independence was undertaken. It was because of our inability to protect our own markets from invasion that the fabric of the Confederacy was taken down and our present form of government established.

Mr. Mason, speaking on this subject, said:

The people of this country demanded a Union stronger than the Confederation, for the very purpose of shielding home industries from the prostrating assaults of foreign competition, through the regulation of commerce with other nations, so as to check or to prohibit the importation of commodities that interfered with the growth and prosperity of domestic manufactures; and so as to give native productions an impetus which would develop all the resources inherent within the boundaries of the nation, essential for the supply and consumption of the population at all times. No fact is more securely established than is this.

Touching this same subject, Daniel Webster said:

I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading, motive South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution, it never could have been adopted.

Upon the establishment of our present form of Government in 1789, we put up the bars by an act of Congress, approved by President Washington July 4, 1789, which act has been happily called the Second Declaration of Independence, which declared as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported:

Be it enacted—

and then followed the list of articles on which duties were imposed.

Under the stimulating effect of these duties, increased by the necessities of the war of 1812, promising manufacturing industries sprang into existence and general prosperity was everywhere visible. But in 1816 we did what the gentleman from Texas now asks us to do, we "took down the bars," and instantly a flood of foreign imports swept in upon us, bringing devastation and ruin to all our industries and all the people. In speaking of this period, Horace Greeley, whom you may remember as once your candidate for the Presidency, and whose words therefore will come home to you with great unction, said [applause on the Republican side]:

At the close of the second war with England peace found this country dotted with furnaces and factories which had sprung up under the precarious shelter of embargo and war. These, not yet firmly established, found themselves suddenly exposed to a relentless and determined foreign competition. Great Britain poured her fabrics, far below cost, upon our markets in a perfect deluge. Our manufactures went down like grass before the mower, and our agriculture and the wages of labor speedily followed. Financial prostration was general and the presence of debt was universal. In New England fully one-fourth of the property went through the sheriff's mill, and the prostration was scarcely less general elsewhere. In Kentucky the presence of debt was simply intolerable. In New York the leading merchants, in 1817, united in a memorial to Congress to save our commerce, as well as our manufactures, from utter ruin by increasing the tariff duties.

This condition of things continued until 1824 and 1828. Then the bars were put up again, and instantly our prostrate industries revived and brought happiness and prosperity to all the people. Our recovery was so marvelous that General Jackson, then President, said in 1832:

Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity and happiness unequalled, perhaps, in any other portion of the world.

Henry Clay, speaking of these times in the United States Senate in 1832, said:

In short, sir, if I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

But in 1832 the cry went up, as now, to "take down the bars," and again we entered upon a period of free trade, and again the disastrous consequences of 1816 followed. The historian, speaking of this period, said:

Again financial depression followed; assignments and bankruptcies resulted everywhere; manufacturers suspended operations, and business grew worse and worse till the culmination was reached in the financial crash of 1837, one of the most disastrous financial revulsions ever known—severer even than that which followed the repeal of the first tariff in 1816. Very few persons could save themselves; property of every description was disposed of at astounding sacrifices. In some parts of Pennsylvania bank-notes were divided into halves, and even into quarters, money was so scarce. In Ohio it was hard to get money enough to pay taxes. So little money was there that at sheriff's sales good horses sold for \$2 each, cows at \$1, and hogs at 6¢ cents apiece. In Missouri a large ox was sold for 12½ cents, hogs at 1½ cents each, and tobacco at 62½ cents per hog-head.

The bars were down then. [Applause on the Republican side.] When free trade or a low revenue tariff had done its desolating work we again put up the bars by the protective tariff of 1842. Promptly business revived, and so prosperous was this protective period that James K. Polk was forced to say in his message to Congress in 1846:

Labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward; while education, science, and the arts are rapidly enlarging the means of social happiness. The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of her territorial limits and in the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth and in the happy condition of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

But again the cry went up: "Take down the bars;" and they were taken down. And what was the result? Let President Fillmore answer, and his answer is specially appropriate in reply to the gentleman from Texas, who claims that a low revenue duty will increase our trade with foreign nations and especially benefit the American farmer. It seems the same argument was then used to bring about the act of 1846.

In 1851, speaking of the results flowing from the repeal of the tariff of 1842, President Fillmore, in his message to Congress, said:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from \$68,000,000 in 1847 to \$21,000,000 in 1851, with almost a certainty of a still further reduction in 1852. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand and raising the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

Following the repeal of 1846, and under a revenue tariff, one disaster after another followed in quick succession until culminating in the crash of 1857, which brought universal ruin and dismay to all the people.

President Buchanan, in his annual message in 1861, said:

With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

In the light of history and experience can it be possible that our

farmers will be deluded into accepting the policy of free trade? I can not believe it.

Whatever may be the remedy for the depressed condition of the agriculturist, one thing is very certain: it will not be found in the markets of the world. On the contrary, do not statesmanship and common sense dictate the course pointed out in the measure we present? Increase the body of consumers at home by maintaining and enlarging our manufactures; secure to the farmer the home market for \$350,000,000 of farm products which last year poured in upon us; and, last, though not least, let him, under the protection we propose, diversify his industry by the culture of flax, hemp, sugar, silk, and wool, and by so doing the surplus of grains will disappear, prices advance, and new fields of profitable husbandry invite to fortune.

I shall not detain the committee longer. We have sought in this measure to reduce the surplus revenues to the basis of governmental needs without impairing a single American industry or depriving a single laboring man of the products of his toil.

We submit this measure to the considerate judgment of the House and the country in the confident belief that if enacted into law it will impart a fresh stimulus to all our industries, relieve whatever of depression there may now exist, and bring to all the people a new era of increased prosperity. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the time of Mr. BURROWS expired; when

Mr. McMILLIN said: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to continue his remarks until he shall have completed them, without limit as to time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the indulgence of the committee for a brief period to-day while I present some of the reasons why we think the measure proposed should not become a law. It would be pleasant, sir, to traverse these flowery fields of imagination into which we have been led by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who has just addressed you. But I feel that my obligations to the country are such as require that I state in a plain, calm way the increases and inconsistencies of the measure now under consideration and give reasons why this increase of taxes should not be made. I shall try to confine myself to this, because I know how many gentlemen are anxious to discuss this question and how impossible it is going to be under the limit of debate suggested for all who desire to get a hearing.

But before I forget it and go to the provisions of this bill, I wish to present one fact in answer to all that the gentleman from Michigan has said concerning the beauties of the home market and in advocacy of excessive rates of duty.

Sir, he began his speech with the announcement that "It is a theory, and not a condition, that confronts us." He seems to be anxious for an opportunity to put himself in antagonism to one of the greatest men of this country, and has done it in that way. Anticipating, Mr. Chairman, that we would have something like the speech we have heard to-day, I went yesterday to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics to find out the condition of the State represented by the gentleman [Mr. BURROWS]. I ask his careful attention to the facts shown by the record there, and I invite him to call in his eloquence and bestow a little of his thought to home affairs. What is the condition there? There are 47,720 farms in Michigan on which are mortgages, and only 43,079 that are not mortgaged. This was in 1883, and the condition is worse now. Is that a "condition" or a "theory" that confronts the gentleman at home? [Applause.]

If this be mere "theory," I suggest to him that his people would probably profit by more (improved) "condition" and less theory. When these words were spoken in reversed order by President Cleveland, they applied to an overflowing Treasury obtained by excessive taxation, which he was trying to induce Congress to remedy. But since that the Republican party has come into power. It has diminished the surplus and is proposing to get rid of the balance. This play on President Cleveland's words is probably a delicate and unique way the gentleman from Michigan has of telling the House his party has squandered the "condition" and left the tax-payer nothing but "theory."

Further, Mr. Chairman, I find that the average rate of interest paid by his poor, overtaxed, and excessively burdened constituents is 7.2 per cent.; and I ask him as a candid man, I ask him as an intelligent legislator, I ask him as one who is always ready to give whatever is the best reason even in a bad cause, I ask him what remedy this bill proposes for those overtaxed people? It increases their taxes on everything except sugar and makes them pay a bounty on that. Let him come back from South America; let him come back from Uruguay and Paraguay; let him withdraw his thoughts from Germany and from German competition, and let him tell his own people of Michigan how it is that, after more than twenty-five years of intense protection, half of the farmers in his State are mortgaged beyond their ability to pay. But, Mr. Chairman, this calamity is not peculiar to the constituents of the gentleman from Michigan.

I went also through the records of the State of Ohio, and I found that in that State, so ably represented by the chairman of the Committee

on Ways and Means [Mr. MCKINLEY], the number of mortgages is 291,640 and that the amount of mortgage indebtedness is \$330,999,000. I ask that gentleman [Mr. MCKINLEY] what he has done in the measure which he has brought before this House to relieve one particle of this excessive indebtedness. By the bill he leaves his people in worse condition. And if a home market is such a beautiful thing, if the erection of walls is so admirable, if the destruction of commerce is so commendable, I ask these gentlemen why it is that none of the good effects have been visited on those two States. Why do mortgages multiply and profits diminish? In Illinois last year alone there were thirty-seven millions of mortgage debts recorded, according to the statistics found in the same bureau.

Mr. Chairman, our Government is supported by taxes. These are obtained from two sources:

First, from import duties.

Secondly, from internal revenue.

But however raised they are the money contributed by the people to meet the expenses of Government, and hence a burden to them.

It would seem when there is a surplus flowing into the Treasury there could be no diversity of opinion as to what should be done; that, when the people are being taxed beyond the needs of economic Government, wisdom of statesmanship and purity of patriotism would alike suggest reduction in taxation. That is our condition to-day.

If we were members of a State Legislature or of a city council and found a surplus coming into the treasury, what would we do? Would we rant about a full treasury being necessary? Would we speak of a tax as a blessing? Would we hesitate as to our course? No, sir; we would make haste to reduce taxation and stop the flow of money to the treasury. Failing to do so, there is no city or State in this Union where we would not be accounted unfaithful servants and hurled from power.

Sir, I welcome this reconfront between the two great political parties on purely economic questions with all the ardor that love of my country and intense anxiety for its best interests could inspire. We are to be congratulated that we have reached a question where sectionalism is impossible and where cursing of brother by brother can no longer be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the present tariff system was adopted in time of war under pretext that it was necessary to carry on the war, and only to be temporary. At the close of the war the interest-bearing public debt was \$2,381,530,294. Of this more than half has been paid, and still not one "jot or tittle" of war taxation imposed on the necessities of life has passed away.

The annual interest charge has been reduced from \$143,781,532 to \$44,715,000, less than one-third its former proportions. Still the war tariffs remain and the people beg in vain for relief. Year after year promises have been made to them that they should have a reduction of taxes. But the promise has been broken as often as made and their condition has become almost hopeless. The promises are made for campaign purposes, to obtain power, and then broken to retain it. A sad commentary on the evil times on which we have fallen is that it takes more bushels of corn to pay the interest now than it did in 1867, at the ruling prices.

Sir, is a quarter of a century of grinding taxation not sufficient? Are the masses to have no relief from oppressive impositions made for the benefit of the classes? Are the agriculturists to be required to contribute forever excessive taxation that greater dividends may be paid to those engaged in other pursuits? Are their farms still to go under mortgage while the empty dinner-pail, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] has left upon his desk, stands as a monument and illustration of the further taxation that is to be imposed upon them? The platforms of all political parties have admitted the justice of their demands for relief. Stump orators of all parties have made themselves hoarse hallooing for relief. The last four Presidents have urged Congress to give it. Still the cry of the oppressed taxpayer goes up in vain and a deaf ear is turned to his piteous plea.

Sir, how long think you this can continue? Will your broken promises not break their maker? Will your hollow hypocrisy not be exposed? The mutterings of discontent come louder and louder; the din approaches this Capitol nearer and nearer, till the tax-payers of the United States, after waiting with a patience which would have aroused the envy of Job, have learned that sixty millions of people are sixty millions strong. They have organized from the Lakes to the Gulf. They have learned, and they will teach you, that you are their servants, not their masters. They demand relief from excessive taxes, and you dare not longer refuse it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes claimed that the object of these excessive rates of tariff is to give higher wages to the workingmen. There is a notable absence of that argument here this time. The contrary has become too apparent for the proposition to be even seriously discussed here as it used to be; but, as the speeches made for home consumption will probably ring with that argument, as they have always done, I propose to give this committee a table prepared by the Superintendent of the last census showing a list of manufactures of different kinds, the whole cost, the labor cost, and the per cent. which the labor cost bears to the whole cost, and then I will add a statement of the rates of duty proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, and let

the country judge whether the duties proposed in this bill are intended for the benefit of the laboring men or to put more money into the pockets of the manufacturers. Here is the table:

Table compiled from the Tenth Census by Mr. Seaton, Superintendent, 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.
Carpets	\$31,792,802	\$6,835,218	21.5	46.31	60.88
Cotton goods	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	35.64	*38.00
Bolts, nuts, etc	10,073,330	1,981,900	19.7	32.00	30.00
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	52.00	41.00
Iron pipe, wrought	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	74.00	62.00
Oil, castor	653,900	44,714	6.8	220.00	125.00
Oil, lincseed	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	44.00	53.00
Screws (smallest)	2,184,532	456,342	20.9	72.00	84.00
Wool hats (cheap)	8,516,569	1,893,215	22.2	68.00	111.00
Woolen goods	160,606,721	25,836,392	16.1	71.00	90.00
Worsted goods	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	67.00	†103.00

* Clothing made, 50 per cent.

† Some worsteds increased to 130.

Take woolen goods as shown in this table. The whole amount made was \$160,000,000; the labor cost was \$25,000,000. The present duty is 71 per cent.; and my distinguished friend sitting in front of me proposes through his committee to fix it at 90 per cent.; yet labor gets 16.1 per cent.

Next, consider worsted goods; and they get worse as they go further. The value of the product was \$33,000,000; labor received \$5,000,000; the labor cost was only 16.9 per cent. Yet they propose to increase duty on worsted goods to 103 per cent. and some worsteds are increased to 130 per cent. Does any man believe that the intention is to benefit the laboring man? I say that our true policy is to keep up this agitation; and if taxes are given in the name of labor and through the votes of labor let us see that labor gets its share.

I remember to have heard the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] in the Forty-seventh Congress say on this floor that instead of being in favor of a tariff for protection with incidental revenue he was in favor of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. This was his position in 1833. But now when I examine his bill, when I look at the increases and the exclusions that are put in it, when I see that in framing the bill the committee have gone on apparently with the determination that there shall be no imports, I think his next platform will be "a tariff for protection with incidental revenue;" for it will be an accident if it yields any revenue. [Laughter.]

Ah! to the casual observer it would seem so; yet when you come to examine the bill, what are the facts? There is a provision that leaves chains where they are, and the bill would seem to show that this duty is only 43 per cent. Yet there is a basket clause to the same section which says that none of the chains shall pay less than 45 per cent. Why not come up boldly and say, "We will increase the tax." But no; the farmer is abroad and with a mortgage over his home; it is not very good stump doctrine, pending a campaign, to increase any part of his taxes without covering up the fact, and they have done it.

Who ever saw such a bill as that presented by the majority? It is founded on no general idea and can be justified on no general principle. It raised the duty on certain woolen goods on the theory that the tariff is no tax and put sugar on the free-list on the plea that the tariff is a tax. Cabbage taxed 3 cents each, and the sauerkraut made of cabbage is not taxed at all. [Laughter.] Hen eggs, edible, taxed 5 cents a dozen. Silk-worm eggs, that can not be eaten, are admitted free.

The present rate of duty on champagne is \$7 a dozen quarts, or 53 per cent.—champagne, that magnificent and fiery fluid which will not cure a man if he is sick, but will soon "fix" him so he does not care whether he is sick or well. [Laughter.] You would suppose an earnest seeker after things on which he could increase taxation would not overlook that, and yet the committee left the duty on champagne at 53 per cent. and raised it on woolen goods to more than 91 per cent., showing that their party have more regard for internal heating appliances than for external. And so it goes from bad to worse through one hundred and fifty-six pages of increases and inconsistencies.

Sir, there is a general change from ad valorem to specific duties. This answers two of the purposes of those who advocate higher taxes. First, it conceals the rate of the duty, or the rate as compared with the cost, from the consumer. It enables the taxing to continue with less complaint by the victim. Secondly, there is constantly going on all over the world a reduction in the cost of goods by reason of new inventions, discoveries, and the use of machinery. When the duty is ad valorem the purchaser gets, with the reduction of the price of the commodity, a corresponding reduction of the duty; but when it is specific he gets no reduction, even if there is a decrease of one-half in the cost of the article.

So these gentlemen, by the substitution of specific for ad valorem rates of duty, provide that the reduction shall not inure to the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. McMILLIN. Certainly.

Mr. BAYNE. Did not the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Manning, and his successor in that office, Mr. Fairchild, both recommend the substitution of specific for ad valorem rates of duty with a view to preventing frauds on the Government?

Mr. McMILLIN. They did to some extent. But you will observe, my friend, that the Democratic party declined to adopt the suggestion.

Mr. BAYNE. I know they did, but those who had to administer the law and knew the necessity for it wanted it done.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, never before has such recklessness characterized the committee in the construction of a bill. Never has such widespread consternation followed the promulgation of one. From every quarter and from almost every branch of trade comes the cry that rule will follow its enactment into law. So great has been the clamor that changes have been made hourly since the bill was first printed, and a change of nearly thirty millions was made after the bill had been voted on in committee the night before it was reported.

Need I give instances of these complaints? One of the greatest industries of Pennsylvania is her carpet manufacture. Millions of money and thousands of her people depend upon this. Many of them say this bill will ruin them.

The duty on tobacco has been raised from 35 cents a pound to \$2 per pound. It is done under pretense of encouraging tobacco-raising. What are the facts? In the Tobacco Journal I find that the average price of tobacco for the last six years in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and New York, States where tobacco is raised to some extent and where it is claimed benefits will flow from this bill, has not been in excess of 15 cents. Hence no increase of duty can enhance the price, as the price is already below the duty.

The cigar manufacturers of Key West and Tampa told the committee that a Johnstown flood or a fire which consumed half the town would be a blessing when compared to the evil which will come in the wake of this bill. Other cigar-makers complain.

Exporters of canned goods of all kinds have represented to the committee that the increase on tin-plate destroys their trade. The domestic workers of tin say they can not stand it.

The manufacturers of electric machinery and of stoves complain at the excessive and unnecessary duty for the first time placed on mica. Thereby electric lighting and motive power are to be made more expensive, and the transparency in the stove through which the darkness and gloom of the room are dispelled is to be taxed. Not content with placing the duty of 138 per cent. on common window-glass and taxing sunlight in the home, the artificial light of the night is to be taxed—taxed by day and taxed by night.

Sir, it was first proposed to put a duty of a dollar a pound on raw silk. But a rebellion arose in the silk-manufacturing centers. Its din reached this Capitol, penetrated the dark recesses where the majority of the committee were framing the bill, and forced them to call a halt. What was to be done? The few producers of raw silk complained that they could not compete with France. The silk manufacturers threatened vengeance if not allowed to continue the importation of raw silk free. They said their machines would stop; their labor would be thrown out of employment, want would stalk in the streets and poverty would succeed prosperity in the mills. Under this cross-fire what did the committee do? Followed the usual tactics. It fell back, as it has so often done, on the farmer and forced him to sustain the shock of this new assault.

It proposes to pay a dollar a pound out of the Treasury bounty on raw silk. It proposes to tax the farmer and raise \$2,000, to be paid as bounty on each ton of raw silk produced in the United States. In other words, the Kansas farmer, who is burning corn in the absence of a market, must pay a bounty to his neighbor who produces silk; over 13,300 bushels for each ton or 373,000 pounds of corn for every thousand pounds of silk. Then he does not own or get the silk after paying this enormous price for it. We imported last year over 5,000,000 pounds of raw silk.

Gentlemen, how do you like it? How will your constituents like this new method of robbing them? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do you not fear you will reach the point where they will not longer bear their load? Do not their impoverished families touch you? Do not the mortgages hanging like a pall over their homes appeal to you and implore you to lift the heavy hand of the tax-gatherer from them, to put not the felonious fingers of unjust taxation into their pockets?

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not all. The committee have recommended the payment of 2 cents a pound on all the sugar produced from cane in the United States. It will take seven millions and a half annually to meet this bounty, even if there is no increase in production. The entire sugar tax, over \$55,000,000, is surrendered, and \$7,500,000, collected off other goods and from other people, is taken out of the Treasury and given as a bounty to sugar-producers, making a change in the Government revenues of \$63,000,000. The committee has been implored not to attempt the bounty system on sugar. The sugar-makers themselves, though not getting as much protection out of the tariff as is proposed by this bill, have begged the Government not to take charge of their business. They foresee that the passage of this bill means the placing of their sugar-houses under the surveillance of Federal officials,

the employment of spies and informers under pretext of protecting the Government against fraud, indictments in Federal courts for alleged violation of law, the employment of thousands of officials to watch sugar from cane to the coffee-pot, and the myriad ills which flow from the Government's intermeddling to run the citizen's business.

On this subject Governor Warmoth, of Louisiana, a very prominent Republican, an extensive sugar-planter, used the following language before the committee:

Mr. BAYNE. How would a bounty operate?

Mr. WARMOTH. It would be destructive to the industry.

Mr. BAYNE. Why so?

Mr. WARMOTH. Because it would disclose the fact, which everybody understands, that the tariff is a bounty, and the moment it is understood that we are singled out and a bounty paid into our hands there would be a universal cry for the destruction of that bounty.

Mr. BAYNE. From whom would the cry come?

Mr. WARMOTH. Unanimously from the country.

Mr. BAYNE. Suppose the effect of paying a bounty would be to develop your industry and make it produce an adequate supply for the consumption of the country?

Mr. WARMOTH. No bounty would be of any benefit to us, because it would be very short-lived. We could not get a man to put capital in the sugar industry under a bounty.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] why it is that in the late campaign in Louisiana he was there making speeches urging the people to support the Republican candidate in order to protect sugar, and yet he comes here and himself lays his hand upon it to smite it down. Has "the condition" or "the theory" changed? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You had better take your hands off. I will go a little further as to the objects of this taxation. There must have been a motive for it. Wise men do not move without motives; intelligent men who have great affairs in their hands at least have something plausible in sight before they take such a radical step as this.

For one hundred years we have gone along without bounties; for one hundred years the producers have not been allowed to go up to the Treasury and take the money out. It is true that Alexander Hamilton, a man who said in the beginning of the Government that the people were not to be trusted, a man who said that the Senate must be made a life body, because it was necessary to check the imprudence of the Democracy, that man who has been read from to-day—been brought forward as the chief apostle of this doctrine—did advocate it in the beginning, but, till now, for a hundred years no man has ever broken into Congress who was rash enough to follow him. But to-day a new doctrine is promulgated, and upon this new doctrine we take issue. We are ready to meet you in this conflict and ready to discuss with you, not only the propriety of giving bounties, but the justice of doing so. It is without foundation in justice and without warrant in the Constitution. The Topeka (Kans.) case, decided by the Supreme Court, Justice Miller delivering the opinion, clearly decides the unconstitutionality of a tax levied for such a purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the committee have at last confessed that our present excessive tariff is a system of indirect bounties, and that they have determined to try both. There were two ways in which to give something to the silk-grower: one, indirectly, by placing an import duty on raw silk, thereby increasing the price of domestic silk; the other by paying the bounty directly from the Treasury after it has been collected from the people. The latter is the bolder way and raises the issue squarely whether it is right to take by taxation money from one citizen to be paid to another to increase the profits of his calling.

By this the mask is moved. The tax-payer can see his adversary face to face and know the hand that smites him. The grasping fingers seize the cash boldly instead of doing it covertly. The issue is broadly made. Let the battle be bravely fought, and let the tax-payers of the country say whether the bounty and largess system can long flourish with an Anglo-Saxon, justice-loving race, who have the intelligence to know their rights and the manhood to maintain them.

Mr. Chairman, what are the consequences to flow from this taxation of one man to make a donation to another, this Peter-robbing, Paul-paying process? Where is it to end? If you give a bounty on silk because it does not pay to produce silk in this country why not also give it on jute and encourage our people to raise their own jute? Why not on figs and produce figs at home? Why not on bananas and raise them under our own flag? The price of corn is down till in some parts of the country it has been burned for fuel. Will you extend your pater-nity and give the farmer a bounty on corn? The price of beef cattle and hogs is low. Will you give a bounty on meat products, and make these pay? The producers of these by much toil pay the bounty on silk and sugar. Are they to receive no recognition from this paternal Government? How much will it cost? What will it lead to? It will lead inevitably and quickly to corruption. The corridors of this Capitol will resound with the footfall of interested jobbers. Committee-rooms will re-echo with the voices of those seeking the Governmental largess. The request will become a demand; the demand a din. It will begin by Congress subsidizing the industries and end with the industries subsidizing Congress.

This is no new business. The Pacific Mail Steam-Ship Line was subsidized. Corruption crept in and did its cankering work. More and more was demanded, and more and more given. A lobby, strong as

Sampson, was organized, and the subsidized line kenneled its hell-hounds around this Capitol to scent out those who would sell their country and to hound down those who would not. Seven hundred thousand dollars, according to the report of an investigating committee was used to corrupt Congress and force the bounty. Like Senator Dilworth's hundred thousand dollar appropriation in the Gilded Age, "it took it all to get it through Congress." The bounty business went from bad to worse till the people, tired of its injustice and disgusted with the corrupt method of obtaining it, withdrew it and returned to the sound principle of "equal rights to all, exclusive privileges to none." [Applause.]

Sir, do you suppose they have so soon forgotten the sad lesson of these scandals? Do you think they will willingly return to a system which is unjust when administered at its best and corrupt when administered at its worst? They will not.

But go on, gentlemen, in your wild career. By and by you will find that this country is thoroughly impressed with the idea of Democracy's great statesman, President Cleveland, that "unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation." [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Sir, the country is now demanding relief at your hands. It is staggering under a weight of taxation too grievous to be borne. Population has increased and currency in circulation decreased. The farmer has been taxed on what he eats, the linen and woolen he wears, and the hoe and hammer with which he works. He has been taxed not merely to support the Government, but to make some other man's establishment pay a better dividend. His wheat has run down in price till it hardly pays for producing, handling, and hauling; his hogs and cattle have gone down till it does not pay to raise them, and his corn has no adequate market.

Yet, sir, under this ruinous policy, while the innocent corn-burner is abroad in the land and the smoke of his cereal sacrifice ascends from impoverished homes, the self-constituted tutelary deities who assume to preside over American homes with such paternal solicitude accept not his sacrifice, heed not his prayers.

Sir, I turn to the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and ask them: How have you met the fearful responsibility placed upon you in an evil hour by an overtaxed, too-confiding, and deluded public? What relief do you propose for the frightful ills that afflict the land? You find the farmer burning his corn. Have you stopped the conflagration? You find the fires being extinguished in many northern furnaces. Have you rekindled them? You find immense woolen manufacturing establishments crashing and in ruins all around you. Have you put an end to it?

You find the farmers mortgaged to death; you hear the rueful rap of the auctioneer's hammer making desolate their homes, and still you go blindly, madly on, taxing to relieve against taxation. You have seen city after city and State after State since President Harrison's election leave the Republican ranks and join the party founded by Jefferson, which took charge of this Government ninety years ago, and whose motto was then, as now, "Equal laws, economic government, and just taxation." Still you read not the handwriting on the wall. You rush rashly on your own mad way. Verily, "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad."

What relief do you propose for the woolen manufacturers, now on the verge of ruin? You add an additional tax to the wool they consume. They say you will destroy them. You found the leather industry one of the most flourishing in this country. Last year our exports of leather and leather goods were nearly \$11,000,000. We went to the uttermost parts of the earth for raw hides and admitted them free of duty. They were manufactured by American hands, moistened with American sweat, and dexterously wrought into fine goods by American fingers, and returned whence they came increased in value to the great profit of the American laborer. You attempted to lay your blighting hand upon that and to wither it. But fortunately the people to be ruined by your rapacity were strong enough to walk into your committee-room, seize you and shake you loose before it was too late.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has not stopped here. Not content with the imposition of duties on things produced in this country under pretext of protecting American labor, they go a vast stride further and more than double the tax on tin-plate. Not a ton of it is made here; not a laborer would be thrown out of employment by admitting it free of duty. At one cent a pound it yielded last year \$7,279,459 revenue. They propose after the next election to make the duty 2.15 cents a pound instead of 1 cent. On the present basis of importations this would yield \$15,650,848. The gentleman from Michigan knew that the poor man would complain of this, so he brought in an insignificant tin bucket to illustrate the extent of the injury done to the interests of the poor by this new tax. But, Mr. Chairman, the injury does not stop with the tin dinner-pail. This is more than a tin-bucket issue.

The laborer living in the city has no marble mansion. He is not able to cover his cottage with enduring copper or fine slate; he has to cover it with tin. His wife takes canned goods from tin cans and cooks them in tin stove-vessels. He can not spare the time from work to return home at noon and "eat his bread with singleness of heart" with wife and little ones; his dinner is taken to furnace or factory in a tin pail. Yet he is to have the cost of his roof, his supplies, and his pail doubled by this tax.

Representatives of vast canning industries, canneries of fish, fruits, vegetables, and oysters, have come before the Committee on Ways and Means and begged that this suicidal step be not taken. They have represented that it would retard or ruin their industries, but to no purpose.

This brings me to another position taken by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], claiming that this bill is in response to the elections in 1888. They both speak of there having been an "issue joined" in 1888, a conflict waged, and a victory achieved. Victory! when a hundred thousand majority was against you on the popular vote! It is true you did have a scant majority in this House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McMILLIN. With much pleasure.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does the gentleman not believe that more than one hundred thousand Republican votes were suppressed in the South and not allowed to be cast?

Mr. McMILLIN. No, sir; that is absolutely false; absolutely false. There never was a greater falsehood perpetrated; and I have got tired of this business of a lot of people standing up with their phylacteries spread abroad, thanking God that they are not like other men, and coming here and criticising others when their own records are as rotten as the cancer's core. What is the record of your party? You stole one Presidency and bought another, and now you talk about a suppressed vote. [Applause on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. McMILLIN. One moment. You shall have an opportunity to get in, but not just now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to suggest that the audience present in the galleries are there by the courtesy of the House of Representatives, and that manifestations of approval or disapproval are not proper.

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, as the gentlemen have said, there was an issue joined and a conflict waged, and I, being forced to it, will tell how it was waged.

It is a fact, known to all men who are not either too blind to see a truth or too wicked to tell it, that the "fat was fried" out of the manufacturers all over the country for campaign purposes. Go to the Post-Office Department and ask even your Postmaster-General how much money he contributed.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But you talk and will not allow a reply.

Mr. MANSUR. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask him a question in this connection?

Mr. McMILLIN. I have but very limited time.

Mr. MANSUR. I know you have; but are you not of the opinion that at least one hundred thousand men were, by fear of being deprived of their labor, coerced into voting for the Republican party against their will?

Mr. McMILLIN. It is a fact generally known, Mr. Chairman, that during the last campaign money was used without stint; votes were bought in "blocks of five." Some of the people who put up the "hoodle" to buy the "blocks" have been rewarded with fat offices. Now, it is proposed to pay others in an indirect way.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The Presidential candidate on our side did not put up \$10,000 as yours did.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to have been foreseen by the committee that that class of our people engaged in agricultural pursuits, constituting, according to our last census, about 47 per cent. of our population, would not longer submit to needless taxation without some attention was given them. They cast about for a sop to be thrown to them.

I imagine when the able gentlemen of the majority got together to consider how to delude the farmer there was silence for the space of a whole hour, in which all present were given over to serious thought and solemn meditation. If they forgot the farmer now he would not forget them in November. A day of reckoning was to come, a day in which the deep secrets of dark committee-rooms would be revealed. I imagine that my distinguished friend from Iowa, Governor GEAR, had to break the ominous silence, and did it in about this fashion:

"Well, Mr. Chairman, we have looked after your iron furnaces at Iron-ton, after Brother BAYNE'S glass-works and iron foundries at Pittsburgh, and after everybody's tin-plate works which do not exist anywhere. Now, what are you going to do for our farmers?"

"The CHAIRMAN (with seeming gravity). Increase the duty on corn from 10 cents a bushel to 15.

"Governor GEAR. Why, that won't help anybody. We exported last year more than 69,000,000 bushels and only imported 2,401 bushels. Who can be deluded to think that affected prices?"

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, what do you say to putting an additional tax on wheat, making it 25 cents a bushel instead of 20? Brother MCKENNA, how does that strike you? You come from a wheat country.

"Mr. MCKENNA. Oh, Mr. Chairman, we will fool nobody but ourselves by this. Farmers can read and write. They can not be gulled. [Laughter.] We exported last year more than 46,000,000 bushels of wheat and 9,000,000 barrels of flour, and only imported 1,946 bushels of wheat. The import duty was only \$389. The difference of duty

would not buy one old horse. We will be laughed at. Besides, we have already increased the tax on chains and farm implements. I feel very gloomy about the whole business.

“Mr. BURROWS. What are you going to do for my State? The farmers there are growing shaky.

“The CHAIRMAN. We'll fix them. Put a duty on cabbage.

“Mr. BURROWS. But we've put sauerkraut on the free-list. [Laughter.]

“The CHAIRMAN. But, BURROWS, old fellow, don't complain. Be reasonable. We had to do something for the Dutch.

“Governor GEAR. I will tell you what you can do and help all of us out West; place a duty on hides.

“The CHAIRMAN. No; that won't do. If we take hides off the free-list now they'll take the hides off our party in November. [Laughter.] But I'll tell you what we can do and what we will do; we'll tax teasels. That sounds fresh and fine, whether it is or not.

“Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But, Mr. Chairman, our farmers won't know what teasels are.

“The CHAIRMAN. So much the better, old boy. The less they know about this bill the better for us.” [Laughter.]

So teasels were taxed, and the farmers throughout the land were commanded to rejoice.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be permitted to continue until he has concluded his remarks. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the committee for their courtesy; I will not ask indulgence very much longer.

Mr. Chairman, let us dissect this bill as it affects the farmer and see what slight cause there is for his rejoicing. The committee, with great flourish of trumpets, announced that they increase the duty on bacon and hams, beef, mutton, pork, and vegetables, garden seed, hogs, corn, corn meal, oats, wheat, wheat flour, and milk. The following table shows how extensively it benefits the farmer:

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.	Value of importation.	Revenue.	Proposed revenue.
Bacon and hams.....	2 c. per lb...	5 c. per lb...	\$45,899	\$5,442	\$13,606
Beef, mutton, and pork.....	1 c. per lb...	2 c. per lb...	12,397	2,155	4,311
Straw.....	Free.....	\$2 per ton.....	2,921	8,676
Teasels.....	Free.....	30 per cent.....	2,309	692
Vegetables, n. o. p.....	10 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	437,377	43,737	109,344
Potatoes.....	15 c. per bu.....	25 c. per bu.....	321,130	132,507	220,846
Hogs.....	20 per cent.....	\$1.50 each.....	4,770	954	2,179
Corn.....	10 c. per bu.....	15 c. per bu.....	1,212	233	358
Corn meal.....	10 c. per bu.....	20 c. per bu.....	952	89	78
Oats.....	10 c. per bu.....	15 c. per bu.....	10,178	2,232	3,348
Wheat.....	20 c. per bu.....	25 c. per bu.....	3,997	389	486
Wheat flour.....	20 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	5,804	1,160	1,451
Milk.....	10 per cent.....	5 c. per gal.....	5,634	568

It will be observed that the duty on bacon and hams is increased from 2 cents per pound to 5 cents per pound; on beef, mutton, and pork, from 1 cent per pound to 2 cents per pound. On straw, which is now free, a duty of \$2 per ton is proposed. A duty on straw! That is enough to make the gravest of our chaplains laugh. The idea of taxing teasels and straw! I have heard of straw bids and straw bonds, but this is the first straw bill I ever saw. On vegetables, not otherwise provided for, the duty is increased from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent.; on potatoes, from 15 per cent. to 25 cents a bushel; on hogs, from 20 per cent. to \$1.50 each; on corn, from 10 cents a bushel to 15 cents a bushel; on corn meal, from 10 cents a bushel to 20 cents a bushel; on oats, from 10 cents a bushel to 15 cents a bushel; on wheat, from 20 cents a bushel to 25 cents a bushel; and on wheat flour, from 20 per cent. to 25 per cent.

Now we come to the duty on milk. [Laughter.] This suggests to the farmer what has been going on all this time with the manufacturer. I have made a little calculation which I will ask that the House indulge me by listening to. Remember that the main things on which it is supposed the farmer is benefited are corn and wheat, bacon and hams, meat products, flour, and corn meal.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. Did the gentleman say that this bill proposes a tax on straw?

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes; a tax on straw.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. After giving us free whisky and free sugar! [Laughter.] The relief is greater than I thought it was.

Mr. McMILLIN. Sir, the import duty under the present law on all of these things is only \$37,497. The proposed duty will be \$56,346, or an increase of \$18,749. That is what they give to the farmer. But now let us see how, like the miserly hypocrite “who puts a penny in the urn of poverty with one hand and with the other takes out a shilling,”

they have taken from the farmer the pretended benefit given to him in the shape of taxation. I will instance only one thing, Mr. Chairman, to meet all of these items to which I have referred, because my time is short and I appreciate the courtesy of the House and do not desire to trespass upon it. But upon the single item of garden seeds I want to show you what they have done.

The proposed increase of duty on the things I have mentioned is \$12,-299, and the increased duty on garden seeds alone is \$18,749. So that after giving the relief to the farmer on these things I have mentioned they go to work and tax him \$6,000 more than is yielded to him on the articles mentioned, by the duty on garden seeds. And on whose testimony was that done? Let us see for whose benefit it was done. Gentlemen on the other side have read so much of testimony that I suppose it will not be amiss for me also to refer to some testimony. Mr. Landreth, the great seed man, appeared before our committee and made a statement.

Here is an extract from his testimony :

Mr. McMILLIN. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars' worth is imported under the dutiable class and \$2,000,000 free, and the American product is \$12,000,000, so it makes about 16 per cent. imported. Is yours an incorporated company or simply a firm?

Mr. LANDRETH. It is simply a firm.

Mr. McMILLIN. What per cent. do you make under the existing tariff?

Mr. LANDRETH. We are about ready to go out of business.

Mr. McMILLIN. What per cent. do you make? If you have no objection to telling us. I do not like to make an inquiry which is improper, but as a legislator I think it is my duty to get all the facts bearing on the case that I can.

Mr. LANDRETH. We do not make 8 per cent. over our expenses. We carry on farms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Virginia.

Mr. McMILLIN. Do you make as much as 7 per cent.?

Mr. LANDRETH. I can not answer that. About 7 or 8. The expenses are very heavy. On our Pennsylvania farms we have spent \$25,000 on fertilizers on 500 acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, in order that they may make 15 per cent. instead of 7 or 8 per cent. on the capital invested, the committee proposes to increase the duty on garden seeds from 20 to 30 per cent. That is a specimen and a fair specimen of the work. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Where does he live?

Mr. McMILLIN. He has farms in Virginia and New York, I think, and in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, but I do not know his residence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have the indulgence of the committee, I will give in detail the enormous increases proposed by the bill.

Sir, the majority boast much of the proposed repeal of the tax on sugar. High as is the present rate it is a revenue duty, for seven-eighths of all the increase of cost on the article goes into the Treasury to support the Government. This the committee could not endure. It was not “a tariff for protection with incidental revenue.” Sugar is, therefore, put on the free-list and the revenue sacrificed. The people would have less cause to complain if the reduction had been made for the honest purpose of relieving them. But it was not. It was made that the duty on other articles might be increased. The tax was removed to be reimposed on articles where seven-eighths of the cost thereby added to them should go to the pockets of individuals, whereas on sugar it had gone to the Treasury.

The reduction was made that the tax on barrel-hoops, pail-hoops, and cotton-ties might be increased from 35 per cent. to 103 per cent. It was made that the duty on common window-glass might be increased to 134 per cent. It was made that the tax on woolen goods might be raised to 91 per cent. It was made that the duty on pocket-knives might be increased. It was made that the duty on tin-plate might be more than doubled. It was made that the smith's anvil might ring in a higher key of taxation and that the farmer's chain might clank a heavier bondage to taxation. It was made that other great increases might be perpetrated. The following are only a few of them:

Table showing increase in rate of duty on many articles in common use.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
116. Common window-glass, 10 by 15.....per pound...	67.61	73.72
116. Common window-glass, 16 by 24.....do.....	115.41	123.10
116. Common window-glass, 24 by 30.....do.....	128.58	135.34
116. Common window-glass, above that.....do.....	132.29	138.04
131. Freestone, granite.....	20.22	40.00
131. Freestone, granite, hewn or dressed.....	20.00	50.00
144. Cotton-ties.....per pound.....	35.00	115.00
147. Tin-plate.....	34.00	74.00
150. Steel ingots, etc., above 16 cents per pound.....	11.89	45.00
151. Wire-fence rods, No. 6.....	45.00	54.00
169. Pen-knives, etc.....	50.00	75.00
171. Table cutlery.....	35.00	50.00
174. Shotguns.....	35.00	60.00
206. Mica.....	Free.	35.00
244. Horses.....	20.00	70.00
245. Cattle.....	20.00	61.94
246. Hogs.....	20.00	45.68
247. Sheep.....	20.00	50.00
272. Eggs.....	Free.	32.91
279. Plants, trees, etc.....	Free.	20.00
290. Fish, fresh.....	Free.	52.10
Schedule F, Tobacco.....	81.00	200.00
348. Pushes.....	40.00	100.00
350. Hosiery.....	40.00	60.00

Table showing increase in the rate of duty, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
350. Shirts and drawers.....	40.00	65.00
363. Burlaps.....	30.00	50.00
368. Brown and bleached linens.....	35.00	50.00
369. Brown and bleached linens.....	35.00	60.00
390. Yarns.....	69.00	100.00
391. Woollens and worsteds, knit goods, etc.....	94.59	125.00
Do.....	88.43	135.00
Do.....	93.81	124.00
Do.....	68.41	147.00
Do.....	67.60	130.00
391. Worsteds, knit goods, under 30 cents.....	73.20	130.00
391. Worsteds, knit goods, 30 to 40 cents.....	68.41	147.00
391. Worsteds, knit goods, 40 to 60 cents.....	67.60	130.00
391. Worsteds, knit goods, 60 to 80 cents.....	68.98	112.00
391. Worsteds, knit goods, above 80 cents.....	71.22	90.00
391. Worsteds shawls.....	61.82	83.00
391. Belts for presses (printing).....	53.14	101.00
392. Blankets and flannels and hats.....	69.70	110.00
393. Women's and children's dress goods.....	68.00	103.00
Do.....	66.00	78.00
394. Women's and children's dress goods.....	85.00	110.00
393. Clothing, ready-made.....	54.00	84.00
396. Cloaks, dolmans, etc.....	60.00	82.00
397. Webbing, gorings, etc.....	64.00	99.00

These were the purposes of the change; these the results flowing from it.

Sir, the committee has not been content with simply placing the tax remitted on sugar on other things, nor have they enlightened this House as to the real effects of the bill. They only claim that the bill is a saving of \$60,000,000, exclusive of the increases. The increases amount to sixty-five millions nine hundred and odd thousand dollars. Therefore there is a net increase of taxation of \$5,000,000, or about five millions on imports, notwithstanding the repeal of the sugar duty.

The committee has omitted from its calculations \$25,000,000 of increases. Tin-plate alone, patent to every one, is one-third of this amount. Under the present law the articles left on the dutiable list yield one hundred and sixty millions annually. The majority report admits that they would yield \$200,000,000 under the proposed law, but an accurate estimate, based on the importations of last year, shows that they would yield more than two hundred and twenty-five millions. Under existing law the articles left on the dutiable list average 41 per cent. rate of duty. The majority admit that their bill increases this to 51 per cent.; but a correct calculation shows it would be increased to 58 per cent. Therefore, it turns out that the sugar duty was repealed to increase the rate of duty on every other schedule and to increase the average from 41 to 58 per cent. Well may the committee say: "We have not been so much concerned about the price of articles we consume," etc.

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of the Government tariff taxes were imposed at a low rate to obtain revenues. Later on they were increased to foster infant industries. The next plea was that they should be high to protect American labor. Now all of these grounds are ignored and the committee promulgate the doctrine of exclusion. This is supplemented by the bounty system, which is still worse. Manufactures are to be built up by bounties, vanquished commerce is to be restored by bounties, prostrate agriculture is to be quickened by bounties, and bankrupt farmers are to be further taxed to pay these bounties.

Sir, we have tried this doctrine of high tariffs for more than a quarter of a century. What are the results? Pretending that its object was to increase wages it has been found wholly inadequate to this task, and laborers have been forced to organize and to enter trade unions to protect themselves. Who denies this?

Pretending to have for its object the building up of a home market for agricultural products we find agriculture prostrate, farms mortgaged, the price of lands run down near the oldest manufacturing centers, and colonization societies organized in New England to reinhabit the abandoned homes. At the same time farmers are forced to organize to get the things they need at reasonable prices and to try to stop their further destruction.

Pretending that it was only temporary in its needs and demands it asks more protection as the industries grow older, and now proclaims through the report of the majority that the object is exclusion of foreign importations. Sir, for months we have had in our midst distinguished representatives of South American republics in grave council trying to devise means of restoring and extending commerce and trying to bind in closer bonds the sister republics of the continent; but before that congress of nations breaks up, while they yet think us honest in our professions, we announce to the world that we want to destroy commerce, not to rebuild it; that to get cheap wool to clothe our people would be a misfortune.

But strange as it may seem some of those who advocate exclusion and pretend to think that commerce is a calamity favor the granting of bounties to American ships that they may sail empty from sea to sea and in ballast from continent to continent.

Mr. Chairman, all sorts of contrivances and devices have to be re-

sorted to even by the friends and framers of prohibitory tariff laws to counteract the evil effects of their legislation. The American manufacturer is allowed a rebate of the duty he has paid on raw materials when he ships his manufactured goods out of the country.

For example, if he imports raw materials on which duty is paid, manufactures them and exports he has refunded to him the duty paid and can afford to sell to his foreign customer that much cheaper; but if he wants to sell to one of his own countrymen the same article the duty is not refunded and has to be added to the other costs of the goods. Therefore, our patched-up laws allow our people to sell cheaper to the British than to the American laborer; to the Russian peasant than to the free-born American citizen.

Mr. Chairman, it is possible some parts of the country exceptionally well located can continue to stand the strain of excessive taxes under which we have so long staggered. In my own State the coal, iron, and limestone lie in sight of each other; cotton or blue grass may be grown on the land. The cotton raised may be manufactured with water-power at the field. There for hundreds of miles is a mild climate producing every agricultural product needed, teeming with population. Draw a circle embracing 25,000 square miles around Nashville, Chattanooga, Memphis, Birmingham, or Atlanta and you have a territory filled with people who require supplies and support industry; but draw a similar circle around Boston, Portland, Galveston, San Francisco, or any other seaport city and the sharks and sword-fish occupy half the territory and it is the home of the porpoise. What sort of a home market does this waste of waters make when commerce is killed?

Whatever may be the condition of the balance of the country, New England has to have a change. She has to get her raw materials cheaper. Her manufactures once had such a market as no other people had anywhere else in the world. The South was then agricultural, but attempted no manufacturing. She made great values, and her four and a half millions of slaves were consumers. Now, her seven millions freedmen are competitors. We no longer go to New England for our cotton or coarse woolen goods. We make them at home. We hear complaint in the Northwest. It must be observed that we no longer keep our smoke-houses and corn-cribs in Minnesota and Illinois. They are at home.

Instead of going to Pittsburgh for iron, we sell hundreds of thousands tons yearly in Pittsburgh or through Pittsburgh; and this industrial revolution has just begun. The land that was prostrate has arisen. The young industrial giant is ready for the conflict. We will ultimately sell our cotton goods in Lowell. The people who have learned that New England can not pay two transportations and compete with them will learn that it is cheaper to ship cotton goods than raw cotton. Then in dead earnest will the conflict for supremacy begin. Then will it be seen that the absence of commerce on the seas is paralysis to the seashore.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following to show increases proposed by the bill:

Table showing increases admitted by the majority under different schedules.

Chemicals.....	\$87,189.74
Earthenware, etc.....	331,770.90
Metals.....	684,916.96
Wood.....	64,483.06
Sugar (above 16).....	18,189.65
Tobacco.....	9,754,069.59
Agricultural, etc.....	8,563,510.56
Spirits.....	25,427.86
Cotton.....	591,772.94
Flax.....	3,521,786.45
Wool.....	15,493,002.94
Silk.....	488,131.21
Pulp, paper, etc.....	257,402.05
Sundries.....	513,903.88
Total.....	40,385,557.79

Sir, there should be twenty-five millions added to this to make it show all the increases.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has already commented with such ability upon the system of allowing the American to sell to the foreigner at a cheaper rate than he sells to the home consumer that I will not enter upon that part of the discussion as I had intended.

I shall not trespass longer upon the time of the House, Mr. Chairman. We are willing to meet this issue as the gentlemen themselves have made it. When they go before the country and state that they have taken the tax off sugar, when all that was obtained from sugar went into the Treasury, to put it upon things where nine-tenths of the burden thus imposed would go into the pockets of individuals, we are ready to meet them on the question. There can be no doubt about the result. Whatever else may be in this bill or out of it, Mr. Chairman, the people of this country will never submit permanently to the system of bounty.

Mr. Chairman, let me in conclusion say it is in the power of the majority to pass this bill. The majority the people elected and sent here would not, but that which you yourselves have made by unseating members can and will pass it.

The Apostle Paul, in one of his epistles, uses this exclamation: "Oh! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" This had refer-

ence to an ancient practice. When a certain crime was committed they did not put the criminal in the penitentiary as we sometimes do; nor hang him as we occasionally do. But worse than these, they took the body of the victim and lashed it to him. Wherever he went he was forced to bear it till decaying muscle fell from muscle, and joint from joint. If he walked forth by day the flies of the air infested him. If he lay down at night, the creeping things of earth made his sleep more horrible than a dream of hell. But by day and by night he was forced to bear his load of guilt till the stench stifled him, and dying he exclaimed, "Oh, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

Sir, when this bill is passed and its enormous increase of taxation, its inconsistencies, its iniquities, and corrupting bounties are known, the people will lash it to the backs of those who so far forgot their country as to vote for it.

And when the ides of November come, when November's sky is bright and clear for Democracy, when November's clouds are bleak and drear for Republicanism, a sad wail will go up from Republican candidates all over the country, the wail of remorse and defeat, "Oh! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" [Loud applause on the Democratic side].

Mr. BAYNE. I was one of those, Mr. Chairman, who felt that a long discussion of the provisions of this bill was not only at this time unnecessary, but that the people of the country would disapprove it. I recollect the fact that in the last Congress we long discussed not only various conditions which confronted us then and that are confronting us all the time, but that we had debated essentially the attitude of the two parties respecting the question upon which we are called upon to vote. I felt that the Senate bill conspicuously set forth the policy and principles of the Republican party and that the Mills bill set forth the views of the Democratic party. Upon that issue I asked over and over again, and my Republican brethren then asked, that no disposition should be made of the tariff until it should be submitted to the people of the country, and that then we should abide by their decision.

If the majority of the people decided by their votes that the Mills bill should be the prevailing policy of this country and adopted into law, that we should cheerfully assent to it; and that if the Republican policy should meet with the approval of the country, as represented by the Senate bill, we should agree to that, and that we should end the controversy. I want to ask the Clerk to read one of the propositions which I then made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I have asked for and insisted upon all along has been that the people of the United States should have a chance to vote upon this issue, squarely presented to them in the Mills bill and the President's message. They will have that fair, square opportunity this fall; and I have commended the President over and over again for his manly, outspoken position on the tariff question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And the people are going to sustain him, too.

Mr. BAYNE. If they do so, all right.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They will.

Mr. BAYNE. But until the people shall have had an opportunity of voting on this square issue, I insist that the free-traders in this House of Representatives ought not to have an opportunity of revising this tariff in the interest of free trade and for the destruction of the industries of the country.

Mr. BAYNE. That was on June 5. On the same day I said this:

Mr. BAYNE. I have insisted all along that this Congress should not revise the tariff, because in 1884 my colleague, Mr. Randall, and other Democrats went into New Jersey and Pennsylvania and Connecticut and other States and insisted before the people that the Democratic party was as good a friend of protection as the Republican party, while you gentlemen down South and in some of the Western States took ground substantially like that which you take here in this bill. Now, I say fair play requires that this issue shall go to the people next November, and if the people then elect a Democratic President and a Democratic House of Representatives, and they come in here and choose to revise the tariff, I will offer no objection or obstruction to their managing that matter in their own way.

On July 3 I made use of the following language in the debate:

Mr. BAYNE. I am aware of that; but how long will that continue? How long did it continue under a low tariff? There was not a period when we had a low tariff that we were not drained of our precious metals; not one. History will sustain that proposition all the way through. There has not been a period of high tariff when precious metals have not greatly increased in volume.

No, sir; we want to adhere to that system which will keep with us our precious metals, develop our own industries, and preserve for ourselves our home markets. That is the meaning of the protective tariff. We want America for Americans. The two tickets now running for election in next November represent emphatically these two ideas: one, the American idea that America should be for Americans and American markets for Americans, and the other, the American market should be open to the whole world.

This discussion, Mr. Chairman, ran on from day to day and was participated in by gentlemen on this side and by gentlemen on that side of the House, and was to my mind the ablest tariff discussion that ever took place in this country, as said by my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

October 18, 1888, when a discussion on the Mills bill took place here, I had occasion to say that a proper duty on tin-plates would give employment to \$30,000,000 of capital and 20,000 men and would keep within the borders of our own country the \$16,000,000 then annually paid to foreign manufacturers for this article. Thereupon the following colloquy took place:

Mr. HOOKER. Why have you not done that before?

Mr. PETERS. We have not had the power.

Mr. BAYNE. No, we have not had the power. When we get the opportunity

we propose to do it, and we propose to have an opportunity after the November election.

Mr. HOOKER. That will be a "deferred hope."

Mr. BAYNE. I do not think so. There is nothing more certain politically under the sun than that the next House of Representatives will be Republican, and it follows almost as certainly as night the day that General Harrison will be elected President of the United States. You mark that prediction, and see if it is not verified by the facts in a short time.

Those facts have transpired and are gone into the immortal annals of history. A Republican House of Representatives has been chosen. General Harrison has been elected President of the United States. The issue was presented to the people of the country by the ablest discussion that ever took place in this country. The people have decided it, and I, as a Republican Representative, feel instructed by my constituency and by the vote of the Republican party to carry out that policy in the bill which we propose. And why should there be any wavering? What individual, either in the Republican or in the Democratic party, rises to such importance that he may antagonize his party and stand out upon some ground of his choosing? I see none.

There is not an essential proposition contained in the McKinley bill, which the Committee on Ways and Means has reported, that was not contained in the Senate bill. There is not a substantial proposition contained in the Mills bill which, I suppose, will not meet with the approval of the Democratic party as represented upon this floor; and I presume that when our bill comes up for consideration amendments will be offered by that party sustaining the view which it maintains. Now, Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, because this question has been decided, because it is *res adjudicata*, in the language of lawyers, I was disposed to proceed to the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule and to take a vote upon it paragraph by paragraph, without any general discussion. I want it that way. I wanted it that way because the matter had been settled by the people, as I took it, and as any man must take it who will recur to the history of the times.

Therefore it was that I favored either a very short general discussion or no general discussion except one speech, which might be made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCKINLEY], and one on the other side by some gentleman whom the minority might choose to present their view of the case in a general way. It was my idea that there should be no further general discussion, and that thereupon we should proceed to the consideration of this bill paragraph by paragraph and enact it into law. I was in favor of that course for another reason. This is a commercial age. The commercial spirit is the motive power of the progress that is being made among the nations of the world.

The commercial method is a short, sharp, and decisive one. Nobody knows that better than my friend from New York [Mr. FLOWER]. Commercial men go right to the point, ask a question, get an answer, and make a decision. We have in this country one thing which is free, too free, and that is "free wind," free discussion, free talk running all along the line. We ought to remember that while this measure is pending in the House of Representatives and in the Senate the business interests of this country will be in an unrestful and uneasy condition until it becomes a law, and that that condition will not be relieved until the signature of the President has been affixed to the bill which we may pass here.

Therefore it was I hoped, therefore it is I now hope that we may arrive at a very early conclusion of our work. I have seen what I commend and applaud, a disposition on the part of the Democrats to acquiesce in what we may do. They seem to accept the result. Some of them have said, to be sure, that another election will turn the tide the other way, and they expect to derive some comfort from the election next fall. They may hope; but that, in the language of General Hooker, is a hope deferred, while this is a question settled, and settled by the votes of the people of the country. And, this being the case, it is my duty, it is your duty, gentlemen, it is the duty of every man to acquiesce in that settlement.

I promised you that I would acquiesce and offer no obstruction if you elected a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic President, and I should have kept that promise in good faith, and I believe you will carry out the same spirit in good faith toward us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we find here a disposition on the part of the minority to call up all the unfortunate conditions of the country, to call upon all those who are suffering from debt, from mortgages, from obligations of any kind, and to evoke their opposition to this bill upon the ground that this bill and the policy of the Republican party as embodied in the existing law have brought upon the country these misfortunes.

Mr. Chairman, if any Republican should ever undertake to compete with a Democrat in demagoguery, that Republican will "get left." [Laughter.] He can not do it. Not because the Democrats are not, many of them, most of them, nearly all of them, respectable men and good citizens; but because the Democratic party represents what is known in sociological science as "the party of resistance," while the Republican party is the party of progress.

The mission of the Republican party is to go forward and to build up. The mission of the Democratic party is to hold back and to pull down. They can not help it if they would, and they would not help it if they could. They are so constituted that they must do things that way, and that way they will do them as long as we have a Democratic

party in this country. Therefore, I say that if any Republican shall undertake to compete with the Democratic party in using arguments, plausible or otherwise, calculated to show that the existing condition of things is not the best condition, and that such condition of things was brought about by the existing policy, no Republican can successfully compete in that line. And I admonish every Republican friend of mine on this floor not to yield to the clamor of the hour which may be raised respecting this matter or that matter, and thus give aid to the Democratic party in its efforts to overthrow the policy of the great Republican party.

What have we heard here in various debates? I have heard my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] and my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] talking about the mortgages that are on the farms in the West. Listening to their speeches one would imagine that the farmers of the United States were about the only people in the world who were suffering from an oppression of that kind. Now, I have taken a little pains, not much, to gather some statistics relating to this subject of mortgages and I want to call attention to them because I do not want any Democratic Representative like my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] to go out to his district and try to make the farmers there believe that they are the worst oppressed farmers in the world. It is not true, and it is not right that any one should attempt to make them think it is true.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. I thought from the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] yesterday that the depressed condition of the farmers was conceded upon that side of the House and was no longer an issue here. It will be remembered that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] referred to the mortgaged farms of the United States, and that was the first authoritative announcement I had heard from that side of the House by way of recognition of the fact that mortgaged farms do exist.

Mr. BAYNE. I have not denied, nor do I deny, that many of the farmers in many sections of this country are oppressed with indebtedness. I am not denying it, because it is the truth. But that simple statement going out as if the farmers of this country were the only men who are suffering in this way, suggesting by implication the inference that the farmers of all the rest of the world are prospering, that our farmers are the especial victims of some policy or some legislation or some theory or some condition which does not affect the farmers of other parts of the world, is as unfair and as untruthful as anything could be. I want to confront all such allegations as that with the body of facts which I have collected.

I first refer to the condition of things in Austria-Hungary, as appearing from the report of Consul-General Goldschmidt, of Vienna, in October, 1889:

There can be no doubt, if the frequent discussions upon this point in legislative and municipal bodies are to be relied upon, that the real property, and especially the agricultural lands, of this empire are very heavily encumbered by mortgages. As to improved city property, except where this property is held by very wealthy owners, it may be safely assumed that it is encumbered up to one-half of its appraised value.

There can be no doubt that the recorded indebtedness on real estate in this empire is constantly increasing, especially on agricultural lands. This fact is in a great measure attributed to the successful competition of American grain-growers in the European markets. The notoriously low and inadequate wages of farm laborers in this Empire are a direct consequence of the same premises.

Consul Roosevelt, of Brussels, reports in August, 1889, as to Belgium:

As will be seen from the foregoing tables, the total amount of the mortgages in the Kingdom recorded in 1885 was 206,367,000 francs, whilst the total amount of taxable revenue from real estate was in 1887 (I can not obtain statistics for 1886) 341,047,000 francs.

All mortgages are required to be recorded in the office of the *conservation des hypothèques*.

I am informed that recorded indebtedness is increasing in Belgium.

Consul Ryder reports, as to Denmark, in June, 1889:

The mortgage incumbrances on landed real estate in the period of 1870 to 1884 amounted to an average of 41 per cent. of its selling value, whilst the mortgages on Copenhagen house property a few years back amounted to 93 per cent. of the buildings' insurance valuations, which is estimated to be equivalent to about 70 per cent. of the property's collective value—that is to say, of buildings and ground.

I next refer to the statement of Consul Moore, of Lyons, as to the condition of France in June, 1889. And it should be remembered that in France they have—what our friends in the West and South are craving for—a tremendous per capita circulation of money. Consul Moore reports:

It has been recently asserted by an economist, Mr. Sbrojavacca, as regards country property in France, that mortgages thereon amount to 13 per cent. of the real value thereof.

Consul-General Raine, of Berlin, speaking of the state of affairs in Germany, says:

In regard to the probable ratio which mortgages and judgments bear to the total valuation of taxable and assessed property, Dr. Martin Fassbender, in a treatise on The Condition of Farmers, 1888 edition, says: "Unfortunately we still lack a perfectly reliable statistical compilation on the subject." Preiser, in his publication, *Erhaltung des Bauernstandes* (Preservation of the Peasantry), Leipzig, 1884, thinks to commit no mistake in stating that 80 per cent. of the entire taxable real estate in the "German fatherland" is *verschachert*—that is, charged with mortgages scarcely redeemable on the part of the mortgageors.

Consul Wamer, of Cologne, in Rhenish-Prussia, reports:

I am credibly informed that from 60 to 75 per cent. of the total assessed valuation of property in this city is covered by mortgage.

Here is the report from Hamburg, by Consul Johnson:

According to the record of taxes, the total valuation of taxable and assessed landed property within Hamburg territory, except the small country districts of Ritzbüttel and Bergedorf, amounted, in 1888, to 1,742,300,000 marks. It will be necessary, however, to call attention to the fact that said valuation of capital is obtained by transforming the rent, or, respectively, in cases of property used for agricultural purposes, the net profit, fixed by taking an average, into capital by calculating 3½ per cent. as interest thereon; and that above sum does not represent the actual purchase value, which, as a general rule, will be found much lower within the city boundary, but which is supposed to be much higher in the country on account of the many building lots not used and paying low taxes.

The indebtedness of said grounded estate by means of recorded mortgages amounted to 926,250,000 marks, being 53.2 per cent. of the valuation of property.

From Italy we have the report of Vice-Consul Touhay, of Turin:

I have not been able to obtain separate statistics as to the ratio which mortgages and judgments bear to the total valuation of taxable and assessed property in this consular district, but the general statistics compiled by the Government give the following results:

Superficial measurement of all Italy.....	hectares.....	25, 140, 174
Approximate value of the same.....	lire.....	29, 553, 000, 000
Net revenues.....	do.....	1, 500, 000, 000

Mortgages registered January 1, 1885.

		Lire.
Conventional.....		4, 280, 214, 185
Judicial.....		781, 136, 429
Legal.....		1, 578, 050, 534

Total.....	6, 589, 401, 148
------------	------------------

Annuit charges on real estate:

Conventional.....	634, 870, 071
Judicial.....	24, 591, 110
Legal.....	133, 865, 054

Total.....	793, 326, 235
------------	---------------

Grand total.....	7, 382, 727, 383
------------------	------------------

In regard to The Netherlands, Consul Eckstein reports:

The estimated purchase value of real property in The Netherlands amounts to about 5,500,000,000 florins, of which over 25 per cent. represents the value of the property which is mortgaged. A comparison as to the ratio mortgages bear to the total valuation of taxable and assessed property seems to be impracticable.

And from Moscow, Russia, Vice-Consul Wertheim reports:

A very large proportion of landed property is mortgaged, probably more than two-thirds of the whole, but there is no means of obtaining accurate information upon the subject.

SWEDEN.

[Report by Consul Man, of Gothenberg.]

Comparison shows that the recorded indebtedness in the year 1882 amounted to 36.1 per cent. of the assessed value of real estate and incomes derived from capital or labor, which are the only estimates of values obtainable; and in the year 1886 to 32.8 per cent. of said values, being a decrease of 3.3 per cent.

Let me next refer to the condition of things in England, free-trade England, with all the glories of the policy to which the Democratic party is so much attached surrounding her and her commercial life with a halo that makes everything so attractive and lovely to our Democratic brethren that I often wonder they do not emigrate from this country and take up their residence in England.

ENGLAND.

[Report by Commercial Agent Williams, of Nottingham.]

Ratio of mortgages to total valuation.

There is no means of accurately judging the proportion such mortgages and judgments bear to total valuation of taxable and assessed property. * * * It is the opinion of those who are competent to judge that the proportion must be from one-half to two-thirds, on the average.

IRELAND.

[Report by Consular Agent Rodgers, of Londonderry.]

Ratio of mortgages to total valuation.

There are no official returns or statistics of mortgages or judgments, and it is therefore impossible to give the exact ratio they bear to assessed property at any specified time, but it is notorious that the registered mortgages and incumbrances affecting landed property in Ireland are more than half the total value of the property. House property is not so heavily, though it is largely, encumbered. It may, I think, be taken that the registered incumbrances and the judgments in question which are capable of being registered as statutory mortgages would usually amount to half of the whole value of the ratable or assessed property of Ireland.

I next refer to Scotland, the home of my ancestors.

SCOTLAND.

[Report by Consul Underwood, of Glasgow.]

Mortgages are generally for two-thirds the value of the real estate. Lenders are unwilling to advance money upon less security. As to the prevalence of the system, it is believed that at least seven-eighths of the real estate of Glasgow is mortgaged to the extent of two-thirds its value.

WALES.

[Report by Consul Jones, of Cardiff.]

Having due regard to the character of the surrounding proprietors and the rules of law and practice of mortgaging, it would be about right to say that 50 per cent. of freehold and 75 per cent. of leasehold properties are mortgaged within the area embraced in this consular district for from 40 to 75 per cent. of their actual gross value. This applies to dwelling-houses, shops, farms, lands, etc., but not to manufacturing premises, chapels, etc.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

[Report by Consul Childs, of Guelph.]

It is admitted that mortgages on farm property are increasing in amount, without any proportionate increase in the value of the property. Other recorded indebtedness, I believe, is not increasing.

MEXICO.

[Report by Acting Consul-General More, of Mexico City.]

The probable ratio which mortgages and judgments bear to total valuation of taxable and assessed property is about 28 per cent.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

[Report of Consul Baker, of Buenos Ayres.]

Description.	Mortgage loans.	Value of property.
National Mortgage Bank.....	\$104,515,000	\$209,030,100
Provincial Mortgage Bank.....	210,000,000	420,000,000
Other mortgage banks.....	35,000,000	70,000,000
Private mortgages.....	50,000,000	100,000,000
Total.....	399,515,000	799,030,100

That is to say, while the total valuation of the landed property of the Republic is \$2,720,922,780, the amount of outstanding mortgages is \$399,515,000. So that while the ratio of the mortgages to the total value of the property mortgaged is one-half, the ratio of the mortgages to the total value of the landed property of the Republic is only a little less than one-seventh.

Recorded indebtedness is not only increasing, but it is increasing very rapidly. Taking the public mortgage banks as a criterion, we have the following exhibit of the issue of *cédulas* during the last three years:

Year.	National Mortgage Bank <i>cédulas</i> in circulation.
1887.....	\$50,000,000
1888.....	74,525,000
1889.....	104,515,000

BRAZIL.

BAHIA.

[Report by Consul Burke.]

The valuation of taxable and assessed property can be obtained only by an examination of the books in the office of the *tabellião*, or notary public. This, however, is an estimate of the extent to which the sugar estates are involved, namely, fully two-thirds of these estates in this province are mortgaged to banks and private parties, as well as the greater part of house property.

ASIATIC TURKEY.

ASIA MINOR.

[Report by Consul Jewett, of Sivas.]

It is impossible to state the ratio which mortgages and judgments bear to total valuation of taxable and assessed property. The ratio is large. All small farmers are, as a rule, always in debt.

Now, here is the report from Palestine. It appears that the lender of money has reached even that city from which the money-lender was cast out a good many years ago, if I recollect aright.

Mr. SAYERS. He has got over into this country now.

Mr. BAYNE. Well, he seems to be in other countries more than here, as these reports will show.

PALESTINE.

[Report by Consul Gillman, of Jerusalem.]

The probable ratio of mortgages and judgments to total valuation of taxable and assessed property is at least 25 to 35 per cent.

Recorded indebtedness is increasing.

AUSTRALASIA.

NEW ZEALAND.

[Report by Consul Connolly, of Auckland.]

It will be seen from the foregoing that the total recorded and secured debt of the colony is \$215,070,585, representing a taxable valuation of \$1,046,873,140.

I next refer to New South Wales. It appears that there not only the real estate is subjected to heavy indebtedness, but every head of sheep seems to be mortgaged before the fleece is cut from its back and sent to England or this country or anywhere else for manufacture. Hear this:

NEW SOUTH WALES.

[Report by Consul Griffin, of Sydney.]

Increase or decrease of mortgages.

Recorded indebtedness has very considerably increased during the last few years, notably since 1884, principally on account of the diminished value of land from overspeculation. The following table shows the growth of the liens on wool and mortgages on live-stock in New South Wales between 1876 and 1888, inclusive:

Number and amount of preferable liens on wool, and of mortgages on live stock, registered in the colony.

Year.	Preferable liens on wool.		
	Number of liens.	Number of sheep.	Amount of liens.
1876.....	920	4,828,951	£752,819
1877.....	994	4,386,378	627,779
1878.....	1,027	4,611,696	714,273
1879.....	1,246	6,602,742	1,035,113
1880.....	1,479	6,216,741	981,172
1881.....	1,609	5,709,061	904,012

Number and amount of preferable liens on wool, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Preferable liens on wool.		
	Number of liens.	Number of sheep.	Amount of liens.
1882.....	1,289	4,837,667	£801,175
1883.....	1,301	6,345,801	1,026,574
1884.....	1,379	4,168,185	973,179
1885.....	1,236	5,263,407	1,327,214
1886.....	1,187	9,049,194	1,454,154
1887.....	1,285	9,296,975	1,685,655
1888.....	1,174	9,800,520	1,282,125

Year.	Mortgages on live-stock.				
	Number of mortgages.	Number of sheep.	Number of horned cattle.	Number of horses.	Amount lent.
1876.....	758	2,480,004	258,447	5,847	£2,157,835
1877.....	1,994	2,565,962	185,796	6,726	2,004,263
1878.....	914	2,647,183	183,210	8,412	2,059,348
1879.....	925	3,538,161	128,685	9,564	2,268,850
1880.....	901	4,858,265	183,555	401	2,318,967
1881.....	1,275	5,982,994	215,564	9,646	4,623,915
1882.....	1,074	3,865,331	112,441	8,391	3,391,984
1883.....	1,077	3,601,890	131,068	7,389	2,486,408
1884.....	1,471	2,696,994	77,241	8,097	1,881,082
1885.....	1,431	4,730,233	117,241	10,764	2,962,471
1886.....	1,363	4,323,553	79,616	10,319	2,404,813
1887.....	1,563	3,954,286	79,312	11,464	2,054,785
1888.....	1,998	4,002,148	80,120	12,364	2,003,216

NOTE.—When any sum has been secured both by a lien on the wool and by a mortgage of the sheep, the amount is included under the head of mortgages only.

In view of these reports from various portions of the globe, I feel justified in saying, when it is asserted here that the farmers of the West are taxed, that their properties are encumbered by mortgages, and that they are suffering in consequence, all of which is doubtless true, there ought to go out in connection with that fact the statement that the farmers of the rest of the world are suffering under mortgages and indebtedness. I have not the data respecting mortgages in this country, and I venture to say that the farmer of this American Republic is in an infinitely better condition than the farmer in any other portion of the globe.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he desire that what he has just said, coupled with the statistics he has furnished, shall be the answer, and the only answer, to the statements made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]?

Mr. BAYNE. No, sir; I am not through yet.

Mr. SAYERS. Very well.

Mr. KELLEY (to Mr. SAYERS). Can not you stand any more?

Mr. SAYERS. Well, we can stand a good deal of that, because it does not concern us.

Mr. BAYNE. There is one thing that does concern my friend from Texas and every Democrat on that side of the House. They cite England as the richest and the most prosperous country in the world. England is their *beau idéal* of the advantages resulting from free trade. England is a country to which they challenge our attention as an example worthy of imitation.

Mr. SAYERS. I merely wanted to know whether the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. KELLEY] would give that as an answer to his constituents when he returns home.

Mr. KELLEY. I will hear what else the gentleman from Pennsylvania has to say on this point; I have not heard it all yet.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, statements have been repeated and will be repeated over and over again on the other side of the House about the depreciation in the value of farm lands in the States of Iowa, Kansas, and some of the other States of the West. One of the reasons of this depreciation is emigration from these States into the Dakotas, into Montana, and other places farther West. This cause has been operating for years past in this country, and will continue to operate so long as new fields of agriculture are accessible. The children of the men who emigrated from the farms of Pennsylvania to Iowa have emigrated from Iowa to the Dakotas, Montana, Washington, and other rich, fertile regions of the far West.

Mr. GEAR. And they have made those new communities Republican, too.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes; they have made them Republican, because the men who emigrate, who are pushing forward the progress and development of this country, are Republicans. The Democrats sit still in the cities; therefore the cities are Democratic. The Democrats have not the enterprise to emigrate. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. They do not seem to sit still in Philadelphia, judging from late reports.

Mr. BAYNE. No, because we have a Quaker element there that is eliminating the Democracy quite rapidly from the body politic.

Mr. SPINOLA. Will the gentleman yield for a single question?

Mr. BAYNE. Well, do you not want me to finish this proposition first and then I will let your question in.

Mr. SPINOLA. I only wanted to ask how many Republicans hang around the gin-mill down-stairs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. Well, my friend from New York is far more capable of answering that question than I am. He is more familiar with the subject. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to call your attention to the farm lands in England—England, the *beau idéal*, as I have said, of the Democratic party, held up before the American people as the country of all countries which is the most prosperous, a country which presents to the world the best commercial methods, the most successful commerce, and the country which should be the example for the people of our own land. In 1880, in this country—the United States—44 per cent. of the working population were engaged on farms or lands producing something. In England but 14 per cent. of the population were so employed; and yet in England and in Wales on 32,000,000 of acres, the total agricultural area of England and Wales—an area twice the acreage of the farm lands of Pennsylvania according to the last census—the depreciation in the rental of the lands amounted in the period from 1875 to 1885 to \$150,000,000. This was a loss of one-third of the rental value and represented a loss of \$4,500,000,000 on the selling value of the lands.

In addition, the farmers cultivating the soil had lost in the ten years \$500,000,000 in working capital. The lands of England and Wales therefore, in area one-fifth smaller only than the area of the farms in New York and Pennsylvania, lost in value in ten years by this expert's estimate—an estimate made by a man handling lands all his life—\$5,000,000,000. And yet all of this under the freest kind of trade. Even "fair Kent," right at the gates of the city of London, and the best lands in England, as was said in a speech delivered in the English Parliament in 1888 by Mr. Brookfield, showed upwards of 25,000 acres of arable farming lands absolutely uncultivated.

Now, if in England, with a small agricultural area of rich lands to my certain knowledge, for I have seen it, the depreciation has amounted to over \$4,000,000,000 in value, why should any Democrat who holds up the protective policy as a bugbear go out to Missouri, Kansas, and other Western States and say to the farmers, "Look at the depreciation which has taken place with reference to these farms in the last few years?"

I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that the farms of the whole American Union have not depreciated in value one cent, but that they have swollen in value, and that the aggregate increase is greater this year than it was last, was greater last year than the year before, and will increase in value every year as long as the Republican party remains in power. Every year has shown an increase up to this time. It may have been that from my friend Governor GEAR'S district certain men have gone to Dakota and got still richer and better farms which produce more to the acre, and it may be that the farms they left in his district have depreciated somewhat in value; but the farm he has obtained has increased 5, 10, 15, ay, 100 to 300 per cent. in value at the same time. So when you come to form the general aggregate, with an increment all along the line, you will find that the increase is largely in excess of the decrease.

Mr. GEAR. And besides he got his farm in Dakota under our Republican homestead laws.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir; under Republican homestead laws. He would not have been given that opportunity if the Democrats had been in power, for they would have sold it all. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. According to the reports from North Dakota he did not get a very desirable farm there.

Mr. BAYNE. I made the prediction, Mr. Chairman, in the last House of Representatives that this Congress would be Republican and that Harrison would be elected; and I make the prediction now that the census of 1890 will show a vast increase in the value of farms in this country over the value given by the census of 1880.

Mr. TRACEY. What does the gentleman predict as to the complexion of the next House of Representatives?

Mr. BAYNE. My impression is that it will be Republican. I should be very sure of that fact if my Republican associates will have the courage to stand up for and pass a fair and free election law which will give every voter in the country a right to cast his vote and see to it that every vote that is cast is counted. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] I do not want anything else myself. I do not want to deprive any one man, Democrat or Republican, of his vote or of his right to vote or of his right to representation here; but I do want every Republican in the country to enjoy the same rights and the same privileges, and if it is carried out the next House of Representatives, in all probability, will be Republican. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, passing from these questions, which seem to have absorbed a large proportion of the time in the consideration of this bill by gentlemen on the other side, I want to call your attention to another aspect of the discussion, which is the charge that the policy of protection promotes strikes, discontent among the workmen. I am only going to call attention to this, and will ask the Clerk to read the report of the Associated Press of one single day as I cut it from the Washington Post the other morning, May 6, I think.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOING BACK TO WORK—MANY BOSSES ACCEDE TO THE DEMAND FOR EIGHT HOURS. NEW YORK, May 5.

The latest returns from the strikers' headquarters show that only 122 men are out of work. Only forty shops are holding out, among them being Hedden & Son, of Newark, N. J., and Morton & Chesney, of Boston.

CHICAGO, May 5.

The great carpenters' strike is finally settled. The necessary papers were signed to-day and ratified by both sides concerned in the arbitration. A last report will be made to-morrow morning to the judicial umpires, and Thursday morning scores of buildings that for four weeks have been practically deserted will echo with the sounds of hammers and saws in the hands of fully 4,000 journeymen carpenters.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 5.

It was claimed at the headquarters of the striking carpenters in this city to-night that less than 1,000 of the men who on May 1 struck for an increase of 5 cents per hour are now out of employment.

ST. LOUIS, May 5.

The harness-makers, to the number of 2,200, struck to-day. They demand an increase of 25 per cent. in wages, which the shop-owners refuse to grant.

MADRID, May 5.

The Spanish strikes are collapsing, except in Barcelona and Valencia.

PARIS, May 5.

Strikers at Lille to-day assaulted a number of workmen and smashed some machinery in a factory. They were dispersed by military.

The labor agitation at Roubaix and Turcoing is abating, though the conference between the masters and the delegates representing the strikers was productive of no result.

VIENNA, May 5.

The Moravian and Silesian strikes have ended, the strikers resuming work on the old terms. The troops have been withdrawn from the disturbed districts.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that our policy of protection here has encouraged strikes, dissatisfaction, and discontent among the working people. I cut that from the Washington Post of May 6, the day before yesterday, and it shows that strikes are taking place in different cities of this country, and they are also taking place in different cities of the Old World. If I had followed that up from day to day I should have been able to show that strikes are occurring in many places in the civilized world. But you will observe there is something of a difference between the strikes in this country and in Europe. Most of the strikes in free-trade England and in other foreign countries collapse and the workmen return to work at their old wages, while in this country they generally get the advance.

Now, why is that so? It is because the workmen of this country are able to lay up a dollar against a strike and against a rainy day. They are prepared to maintain themselves and their families during the strike, while in these other countries the workman by reason of his poverty must succumb. Is not that an answer to the charge that protection does not benefit the workingman? Is this free-trade policy going to bring any advantage without depressing the American workingman and his manhood, and is the Democratic party going to place itself in an attitude of sustaining the capitalists against the workmen? If you do, strike down the policy of protection, reduce the wages, and you will reduce the workmen to poverty and will not impoverish the rich men, who will be able to live anyway.

Therefore, if any gentleman argues that this policy of protection does not help the laboring man, that it does not enable him to maintain himself and his family, he simply does not read the signs of the times or acquaint himself with the actual facts of the situation.

Any man who will examine must see that in this great protective country, where wages are high, and high in consequence of protection, the workmen can make that contest; whereas in the countries where there is no protection and where the wages are low the workmen can not make that fight. That is all there is to it. But you can not fool the workmen, for they know that and know it well. Before the Committee on Ways and Means the workmen seemed this year to take more interest in protection than the manufacturers did. My brethren on the committee all know that.

But I must hasten along, because my friend from New York [Mr. FLOWER] desires to be heard this afternoon.

My friend, the chairman, who presided over the committee, said that he was very anxious to hear something respecting tin-plate. That subject has been so elaborately and so forcibly presented by my friend, the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCKINLEY], and my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], that I shall say but a word or two on the subject. But I want to say that we want a duty put upon tin-plate. The people want it because they want the working people of this country to manufacture the \$22,000,000 worth of tin-plate we are importing into the country.

They want to give employment to the labor that will make tin-plate. They want to keep the capital in this country that goes abroad under existing conditions. The opposition to the duty on tin-plates came from some of the importers. The importers have endeavored to stir up the tin-can industry, the tin manufacturers and roofers all over the country. They sent circulars out and asked the parties to whom they were sent to sign them and forward them to their members of Congress. Now, a man who was thoughtless about this thing would probably just sign such circular and send it to his member of Congress; the man who would think of it awhile would not do that.

But while the importers were busily engaged in this business, and

not apparently with very great success, the Tinned Plate Association, which is desirous of reviving and establishing this industry in this country, sent out circulars to the tanners, the manufacturers of tin, the roofers, and the tin-canners, the classes of persons who would be most affected by an injurious duty on tin-plates, inquiring whether the duty on tin-plate should be raised to such a point that in this country we should be able to make tin-plate. Numerous responses came from every State, I believe, in the Union.

The following list gives the proportion of the responses for and against the increased duty:

States and Territories.	For.	Against.
California.....	36	11
Connecticut.....	50	16
Florida.....	9	3
Georgia.....	7	7
Indiana.....	79	60
Idaho.....	3	0
Iowa.....	33	18
Indian Territory.....	3	1
Illinois.....	164	88
Kansas.....	36	22
Kentucky.....	2	1
Louisiana.....	12	1
Maryland.....	11	16
Minnesota.....	17	7
Missouri.....	77	36
Montana.....	3	0
Maine.....	48	16
Michigan.....	48	18
Massachusetts.....	151	53
Nebraska.....	16	5
New York.....	247	82
North Dakota.....	2	1
New Jersey.....	49	28
Nevada.....	6	1
North Carolina.....	12	17
Ohio.....	255	104
Oregon.....	11	3
Pennsylvania.....	224	143
Rhode Island.....	12	8
South Carolina.....	9	10
South Dakota.....	7	3
Texas.....	24	10
Tennessee.....	16	28
Utah.....	6	0
Vermont.....	34	22
Virginia.....	18	39
Wisconsin.....	29	19
Washington.....	11	4

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. What are those?

Mr. BAYNE. These are replies received from canners, tanners, and roofers throughout the country, the men who have to buy the tin-plate for use.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. They appear to be about two to one in favor of the duty.

Mr. BAYNE. About two to one. And these replies were entirely voluntary. They were in response to a circular sent out by this association. I have the circular here and I shall ask to have it printed with my remarks in connection with this tabular statement of the replies.

The circular is as follows:

To the consumers of tinned plate and others:

GENTLEMEN: The manufacture of tinned plates in this country is a subject that is of interest to all consumers of that commodity, and, as many thousand circulars containing gross misstatements have been scattered through the country by opponents to home production, we deem it necessary to once more give our side of the question.

That tinned plates can be made here and sold at average former market prices is not disputed, but the obstacle in the way of our manufacturers is the much lower cost of production in other countries.

The latter enables the foreign makers and their agents in the United States to reduce prices temporarily to such an extent as to prevent home producers from competing with them. The methods employed by these monopolists to extinguish, or rather choke off, new comers in the business are well known, and it is hardly necessary to go into details on that point. The prices for tinned plates are rapidly declining at present, and the cause for this can be found very readily from a speech made by Mr. J. H. Rodgers, of the South Wales Tin-Plate Company, one of the leading concerns in Great Britain. The question of restricting production for the purpose of putting up the price on tinned plates was being discussed, but the subject died instantly when Mr. Rodgers gave his views on the subject. His speech to his workmen was published in the Cardiff Echo of March 3, and the substance was printed in the Commercial Gazette, of Pittsburgh, on March 27, under the following head-lines:

"GETTING SCARED—A WELSH TINNED-PLATE MANUFACTURER WARNS AGAINST COMBINATIONS—THEIR FRIENDS NOT IN POWER—NEW MARKETS NOT EASY TO FIND IF AMERICA MAKES HER OWN TINNED PLATES—AN ADVANCE IN PRICE NOW MAY PRODUCE THEIR RUINATION.

"The tinned-plate manufacturers of Wales have been urged by some of their number to enter into a combination to shut down their mills for the purpose of curtailing production and advancing prices. The matter seems to have met with quite general acceptance by all the firms but the South Wales Tinned-Plate Company. The managing partner of the firm, J. H. Rodgers, addressed his workmen on the subject and opposed the move. His speech, as reported in the Cardiff Echo of March 3, contains the following allusions to the American tariff question, and is of interest:

"A year ago the protectionist party in the United States, for the first time in many years, was able to get a bill passed by the Senate more than doubling the duty on imported tinned plates, with the object of enabling the steel-makers of America to manufacture plates profitably and to exclude those made in this country. The House of Representatives threw out the bill, but now the pro-

tectionist party is in a majority in the lower House, so that those in America who are endeavoring to prevent the duty on tinned plates being raised have a more difficult battle to fight than they had a year ago, and those among us who are trying to form a combination to close all tinned-plate works in Wales for a time, if successful, would simply succeed in arming our opponents with the strongest weapons of attack."

"He then stated that the forming of a combination to shut down the tinned-plate works would be but a fulfillment of the prophecies of the protectionists, and he regarded it as eminently unwise and hazardous. Continuing, he is quoted: 'I could give you further evidence to prove how undesirable and how dangerous any combination would be to oblige the Americans to pay higher prices for plates. The total exports of tin boxes and tinned plates last year were 7,400,000. Of these the United States took 5,500,000 boxes. Consider what would be the result to all of us here if the United States should make her own plates, as she now makes her own steel rails, pig-iron, etc., which not many years ago were all made in this country. Some tell us that if such a state of things comes about we must find new markets; but where are we to find them? And if they are to be found, why do not the owners of the works that are now idle for want of orders seek them out and open up business with them? It seems to me that the first results would be that tin-plate makers would have to reduce the cost of manufacture to meet the increased duty. As far as I can see at present the only direction in which the cost could be reduced would be in labor.

"The firm has the largest output of any single firm in Wales; it has works at Llanelly and at Cwmbrwrla. The workmen assented to the proposition of the firm, and decided to continue at work in spite of efforts of other manufacturers to get them to come out."

Now let the bill before Congress be defeated and the foreigner will have full sway and our consumers will have to pay the tariff, duty or no duty. The assertion that an increased duty will destroy the canning and tinware industries is hardly credible. There have been fluctuations in prices from other causes to the extent of \$5 per box within short periods, and the general experience is that trade is best when prices are high. The increase in price which might possibly be caused by the increase in duty can not, in any event, exceed the additional duty, and this is at an average of 75 cents per box.

The 750,000 people who (our opponents claim) are supported by the industries which consume tinned plates will not suffer, but through the introduction of the tin-plating industry in the country additional support will be given to a corresponding increase of persons (about 250,000), and this will be a class of people who will be large consumers of tinware and canned goods. We estimate that 100,000 families will be directly supported by this new industry in the United States. The statistics show that 200 cans are consumed annually by each family; consequently the demand for canned goods will be increased by fully 20,000,000 cans at an average price of 10 cents per can, which will amount to \$2,000,000. It is doubtful whether Harford County, Maryland, can supply the large increase with their total product of canned goods.

The canners and other consumers of tinned plates who oppose our agitation certainly do not understand the situation, or they would not antagonize our efforts to secure a protective duty on this article. If the industry is established in this country it will undoubtedly increase their business here, and not in any way interfere with their foreign market, as the law provides for a rebate of the duty on tinned plates manufactured into covers of any kind. Within three or four years the price of American tinned plates will be so reduced that the rebate privilege will not necessarily be a consideration.

Another important point that should be brought out is the fact that manufacturers who have a monopoly on any class of goods cheapen the cost of production by putting an inferior article on the market. Particularly is this the case in the tinned plate business, and frequently, very frequently, there appear accounts in the newspapers telling of how many families have been poisoned by eating canned fruit or meat. This is due wholly to inferior and cheaply made tinned plates, not to the quality of goods contained in them. If this monopoly, held by Great Britain, was abolished there would be an incentive to manufacturers, both in this country and across the water, to make nothing but a first-class article, and this rivalry would not in any way interfere with the production of tinned plates in the United States or in England.

The fact that tin mills will exist in this country will enable the consumer to visit the place of manufacture himself and there make known his wants and requirements, instead of securing his order through several middle-men.

In the last national election the American people declared themselves in favor of protection to home industry. Why, therefore, should this one branch of the metal industry remain unprotected? The duty on common sheet-iron and sheet-steel is from 1 to 1.4 cents per pound. Tinned plates are made by polishing and coating sheet-iron and sheet-steel with tin, thereby nearly doubling the amount of labor. The Ways and Means Committee, in the new tariff bill, propose to make the duty three-fourths of a cent per pound more than that on black iron and steel, or the same as is now the rate on sheet-iron coated with zinc, spelter, or other metals.

This is but simple justice and equity.

One matter that has not been mentioned is that it is now an assured fact that block tin will soon be produced in Dakota in larger quantities than in the celebrated Corn wall mines, which will be of great advantage for this country in the manufacture of tinned plates, and will insure a pure article, and consequently a greater and increased sale of canned goods. The persons who will be employed in the production of the block tin will equal the number that must be engaged to produce tinned plates, and they will in turn furnish a livelihood for a quarter of million people. It will be seen that if half a million people will be supported by the placing of a protective duty on tinned plates and by the development of the Black Hills tin mines the canners and others who use tinned plates can afford to forfeit their export trade and yet be gainers by the proposed new law. But this will not be necessary, and canned goods can be exported as heretofore, as already stated.

We desire an expression of your opinion on this subject, and inclose two slips, one in favor of and the other opposed to any change in the present duty on tinned plates. Please sign one, inclose in stamped envelope, and return to this office at your earliest convenience.

Very respectfully yours,

THE AMERICAN TINNED PLATE ASSOCIATION.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you see our policy is to keep within our own country the \$22,000,000 we now send abroad for tin-plates.

It is stated that in the Dakotas they have found vast quantities of tin and will be able to supply us with all that we need. Senator Moody told me that he had seen great pieces of block tin from the ores of South Dakota. There are miles and miles and ledge after ledge of tin ore among the rocks of Dakota.

Mr. SPRINGER. Why did you not put a protective tariff on that to encourage its production? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. We are just going to do that now, and I hope my friend from Illinois will agree to it, and thus make his State prosperous.

Mr. SPRINGER. Why did you not put it in your bill?

Mr. BAYNE. We are putting it in now, and we are going to keep it there.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not tin ore. You have not put tin ore in the bill.

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, tin ore. Well, we have not got sufficient information yet about tin ore; but just as soon as we know that we have an abundance of it in this country we will put a duty on it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Why, you have just said that there was an abundant supply of it out in Dakota.

Mr. BAYNE. I said that Senator MOODY had told me so. I do not know the fact myself; and, unlike my friend from Illinois, I am not in the habit of asserting a thing unless I know it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The fact was easily ascertained, though, if the gentleman had been very anxious about it.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, this tariff bill is the best ever presented to the House of Representatives. It is protection all along the line. It reaches every industry. It reaches the rich manufacturer; it reaches the workingman in his mill; it reaches the farmer on his farm; it reaches the sewing girl in the garret. There is not a hand manipulation made by a human being in this country that is not protected by this bill.

A MEMBER on the Democratic side. Did I understand the gentleman to say that it "reaches for the farmers?" [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. No. My friend is altogether too facetious. It protects every industry and makes every one prosper, and it will do what more? Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal of talk about money and about the coinage of silver and about one bill and another on that subject. The protective policy has given to this country its great volume of precious metals, and the moment you adopt a bill like the Mills bill or the bill which President Cleveland advocated that moment you are going to drive out of this country its great volume of the precious metals and leave it in the condition in which the Democratic party has always left the country, without precious metals.

We have now over one thousand four hundred millions of the precious metals, and why have we got that amount? Simply because from 1876 to 1887, including those two years, our exports exceeded our imports by over \$1,600,000,000. Now, suppose that during that period of time our imports had exceeded our exports by one thousand six hundred millions, where would the gold and silver that are now in this country be? Inevitably that gold and silver would have gone abroad to pay the balance of trade against us; but because we had the protective policy in operation, because the balance of trade was in our favor to that extent, we accumulated in this country that \$1,600,000,000, and there is the basis of your currency.

I tell you, my friends, this protective system and your fiscal system are so interdependent, so interwoven, that if you should strike down the protective system you would strike down your gold and silver basis. I do not think it requires any greater ability to understand that than is required to understand single-entry book-keeping. It is a question of buying and selling, and entering up at the end of the year how much you have sold and how much you have bought. If you have sold more than you have bought, you have in your safe the amount of money which represents the excess. That is all there is to this question. I have no personal interest in protection, not a particle; I have not a single industry that I am interested in personally.

I have been asked to vote against a protective duty on lead ore because some of the people in my district want free lead ore; but I have said to them: "This is not a local issue with me; this is a national issue. I do not agree with General Hancock, who called the tariff a local issue. This is a national issue; and if lead ore should be protected at all it should be protected all along the line; and when you have protection for your paints and your various products that are made from lead, you must accord protection to the raw material, the ore which is produced in this country."

Mr. SPRINGER. What explanation does the gentleman give of the action of the committee in putting sisal grass on the free-list?

Mr. BAYNE. We do not produce it.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it comes in competition with hemp and other articles that we do produce.

Mr. BAYNE. We do not mind that. We are not that kind of protectionists.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The Agricultural Department has suggested that it can be produced in this country.

Mr. BAYNE. Well, you start the culture and we will give you a bounty. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I entertain the hope that next Monday we shall take up this bill for consideration in detail. There is one excellent example that the Democratic party sets us, the only one I can think of now; I do not believe I know of any other, but it is a good example. I refer to their cohesion as a party. They stand together; they stand by their party associates; they stand by their committees; they support what comes from their committees and put it through. It is true they had to make a number of concessions in the last Congress to representatives from various districts in order to secure thorough cohesion.

They had to make a concession to my friend from Chicago [Mr. LAWLER] with reference to glue in order to get him into the ranks; and they made the concession and secured his co-operation. And my friend

from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] secured, I believe, a certain concession respecting plate-glass; the concession was made for the sake of unanimity. Those things were done, and then the party was united; they supported their bill; they put it through. The Republican party of this country expects this Republican Congress to act in the same way; and my wish and prayer is that we may accomplish the result at the earliest possible period. [Applause on the Republican side.]

During the delivery of the above remarks, the Chair announced that the time of the gentleman had expired; when

Mr. GEAR said: I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. FLOWER. I shall have to object, because it takes me into the middle of my speech if we adjourn at 5 o'clock.

Mr. BAYNE. Give me a quarter of an hour and I will ask unanimous consent to continue in session until fifteen minutes after 5.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We will remain in session until the gentleman from New York concludes his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania being allowed to continue his remarks for fifteen minutes? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAYNE then resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

Mr. FLOWER. Mr. Chairman, the framers of this bill have wholly misapprehended the situation in this country and misunderstood the demand that has forced them to offer a measure dealing with the income of the Government. That situation is industrial stagnation and a plethoric Treasury, due, in a large measure, to an unjust and unequal system of overtaxation. The public sentiment that has compelled this Congress to take some action to relieve the country of this condition of affairs has very plainly indicated the will of the people that this relief shall be afforded by a reduction of taxation and a readjustment of the rates of duty based upon the principle of justice to every interest concerned and perfected without injury to any. The demand for a revision of the tariff on this line should be religiously complied with, and we, as the Representatives of the people, should at once proceed in good faith to reduce taxation. In this we should carefully guard against any such discrimination in favor of one industry as will result disastrously or disadvantageously to another.

Our object should be to promote every legitimate interest that is to be affected by our action upon this great subject, and anything that falls so far short of this as to select for favor or for disfavor any occupation in which a portion of our people may be engaged goes just that far in the establishment of injustice and oppression and falls just that much short of the performance of a plain public duty.

The purpose of this Government is the establishment and maintenance of equal and exact justice among all the people, and in effecting that purpose the bill before the House fails utterly. Whatever may be its effect on the revenue, its effect on taxation and the interests of certain industries is too patent for discussion. It largely increases the taxes on many of the necessities of life and strikes with a ruthless hand the occupations of many of our people.

It is not my purpose now to enter upon a discussion of the general policy of protection or even of that new phase of protection exhibited in this bill by which it is proposed to increase duties periodically as our industries grow older; nor, indeed, to enter upon any general discussion whatever; but, as there are in this measure some of the most flagrant violations of the plainest requirements of simple justice and fair dealing, I shall content myself with directing attention to a few of these.

In my opinion there is no dictate of duty that is more imperative than that an honorable occupation now in existence shall not be destroyed merely in order that some other industry may reap greater profits or that some industry not now in existence may be inaugurated, unless it is that no honest occupation shall be destroyed wantonly and for the benefit of nobody within the jurisdiction of our country. This, it seems to me, is so plain that there is no room for argument concerning it, and so broad that all may stand upon it as upon common ground.

It involves no question of free trade, no question of tariff for revenue only, no question of incidental revenue or of incidental protection; but is limited to the consideration of the policy of increasing present duties or levying new ones for the mere purpose of adding to the burdens of some industries in order that others may become more profitable or that new ones may be created. To assert that a policy looking to this end is proper is to assert that our citizens are not equally entitled to the protection of the law and that their industries are to be treated, some as pensioners and some as bounty-payers. The inauguration of such a policy means that many industries now none too prosperous are to be handicapped with the support of others that, whether otherwise in a prosperous condition or not, are to render no compensation for the benefits they are to receive.

This bill disregards all considerations of the equality of citizens and industries under the law and proposes to increase present duties and levy new ones in the interests of partiality and unjust discrimination.

Without undertaking on this general debate to enumerate the many features of the bill which, in my opinion, are subject to the criticisms which I have just stated, I can not better illustrate, in advance of the examination of the items of the bill in the Committee of the Whole, than

by considering briefly the provisions of this bill with reference to fruits. I do so because those articles, in this age of rapid transit and general advancement, have passed from luxuries to necessities with all of our people, and with none more so than the great constituency which I have the honor to represent on this floor. It can be demonstrated that the manner in which this bill deals with the item of fruit is a fair illustration of its unfairness, injustice, and insincerity in its dealings with the larger commodities in the various schedules.

There are in the city of New York and elsewhere in the country thousands of persons engaged in the handling of fruits. Like men in all other occupations, they endeavor to supply the demands of their patrons at all seasons of the year. They have to satisfy many tastes and to accommodate their business to the various degrees of wealth of those upon whom they depend for their custom; and in order to do this they are compelled to deal in the products of many countries and that owe their peculiarities to many climatic conditions.

Their business is hazardous at its best. They must contend with nature in every mood. The heat, the frost, the rain, and drought are the natural enemies of their trade, and their merchandise must be converted into money upon receipt or else it will perish on their hands. This business extends its ramifications throughout every stratum of society. The men, women, and children of every grade must have, or should have, their share of these fruits that their health and comfort may be promoted. They contribute to the pleasures of the healthy and ameliorate the condition of the afflicted.

The profits of dealers are usually not large and are shared in by the wholesale merchant and the poor men and women, who, with a few pennies to invest in stock, vend their wares from stands erected on the corners or peddle them on the streets. The people are thus supplied with fruit at the lowest prices that will give a living profit to the dealers.

When the Government requires a revenue, these fruits may be fairly considered as subjects of taxation; but when the object of legislation is to reduce the income of the Treasury, it is not easy to see how we may justify an increase of duties on these commodities of universal consumption that are so largely instrumental in the promotion of public health and comfort, and thus greatly cripple, if not destroy, an industry upon which so many persons depend for a livelihood.

In spite of every consideration of a public nature and of every regard for the health and comfort of the people, and in spite of every obligation resting upon us to deal justly with every occupation subject to the influence of our laws, we are asked by a few growers of oranges and other fruits in Florida and California so to increase duties as to restrict or prohibit the importation of oranges from the Mediterranean, Italy, Sicily, and Spain in order that they may have the opportunity of supplying or attempting to supply the home demand at higher prices, and this, too, in the face of the fact that the bulk of our importations is brought here when the domestic product is not in the market, and in disregard of the fact that the imported oranges, even when selling by the side of the domestic, are sour, of a different quality and character, and sell for a much different price, to gratify a very different taste and to supply a very different character of custom.

The Florida product is put upon the market principally in the months of November, December, January, and February, and the statistics show that for the last three years—1887, 1888, and 1889—of 3,836,545 boxes, 484,964 cases, and 238,291 barrels of oranges brought into this country from all sources, only 969,603 boxes, 190,466 cases, and 93,888 barrels came in those months of those years; so that the competition, even if the imports had been in all respects of the same character as the domestic oranges, would have been but slight. Being of a different character, however—that is, sour, while the domestic orange is sweet—the competition was scarcely perceptible.

The foreign orange costs about \$1.20 per box in the countries where grown; the duty amounts to about 20 per cent. on the oranges, and, adding the duty on packages and charges, about 40 per cent. They are the oranges that we see sold on our streets from stands and wagons, twenty and twenty-five oranges for a quarter, while Florida oranges sell for a much higher price and are purchased to supply the tables of the wealthier classes. Indian River, Florida, oranges sell for from \$3 to \$4 per box.

The present rates of duty are 13, 16, 25, and 30 cents per box, according to capacity, 55 cents per barrel, \$1.60 and \$2 per thousand when in bulk, and when in packages not specified in the law, 20 per cent.; and last year we collected on imported oranges \$420,329.47; or, in other words, the oranges consumed here last year cost at least that much more than they would have cost without the tariff. But the Ways and Means Committee has been entertained during its hearings with appeals the most plaintive and pathetic to rescue the perishing industry of orange growing from the fate that we are told is sure to overtake it, by increasing these rates, and accordingly the bill proposes to levy on the boxes now subject to 13 cents, 25 cents; to double the rate on those paying 25 cents; place on those paying 55 cents a duty of \$1; add 20 cents for each fractional foot of capacity of package to one class now paying 20 per cent.; to raise the rate on another class now paying 20 per cent. to 25 cents, 50 cents, and \$1 per box, with 20 cents additional for each fractional foot in the capacity of the box, and \$2.50 per thousand in bulk.

The present rate of \$1.60 is raised to \$2.50, the 16-cent and the 30-cent rates are to be raised to 25 cents and 50 cents respectively, and the 20 per cent. rate on one class is to be raised to \$1 per package of stated capacity, with 20 cents additional for each fraction of a foot additional in capacity.

The probable effect of this wholesale increase of duties on the revenue is purely speculative, as it is impossible to tell what effect it will have on imports and we have no data from which to reckon the effect even if imports continue as they were last year. In addition to all this, the rebate heretofore allowed on damaged goods is to be repealed, with the result that the duties on the merchantable fruit will be largely increased.

The probable effect of this will be to stop importations and deprive the people of cheap oranges; to throw out of occupation many thousands of the poor who derive their subsistence during a portion of the year from the traffic in this fruit; disastrously to affect a large amount of capital invested in the foreign-fruit trade, and to destroy the business of box-making in Maine and other States where the boxes for these imports are now made. The rebate allowed by the bill on boxes manufactured in the United States is a mere bagatelle. It will not even serve as sop to the box-makers, and may as well be left out.

And why is all this to be done? Merely that the orange-growers of California and Florida may have the exclusive control of the home market, the demands of which for a large portion of the year they will be unable to supply. California can scarcely be considered in this matter. Her oranges come in but small quantities east of Chicago and the foreign fruit goes in but small quantities west of that city. The portion of California oranges that goes to New York, Boston, and other Eastern markets commands such high prices that it is beyond the reach of any but the wealthy and is purchased by a class of people so entirely different from the consumers of the foreign fruit that it can in no proper sense be said to come into competition with it.

If these consumers could not buy foreign oranges, they could buy none. But, disregarding all considerations of this nature, there is another and a controlling one why the poor people of the country should not be compelled to choose between the alternative of going without oranges and paying tribute to the orange-growers of the Golden State; that is, the profits on orange-growing in that State are already so enormous that the halcyon days of '49, with their wealth of gold, are being forgotten in this new era of golden fruit and harvests of riches. I cheerfully make this gratuitous contribution to the advertisement of California's boom. I quote from the Ontario Observer, published in Ontario, Cal., August 17, 1889:

Could the profits and pleasures of orange and lemon growing be fully realized by the Eastern people, those who desire a delightful home, combined with a moderate income, and those of more ample means who desire pleasant occupation, combined with the reasonable certainty of future wealth, what an exodus there would be from the frozen North, the flood and storm-swept East, and from the blizzard and cyclone of the Western plains to Southern California, with its glorious climate and grand opportunities for lovely homes and ample wealth; but let it not be imagined that these can be acquired without patience, industry, and some capital. The facts are that the profits derived from the culture of citrus fruits, where the climatic conditions are suitable, are so enormous that were we to give a mere personal statement we should be accused of attempting to mislead our readers by deliberate falsehood, and, to avoid any such serious charge, we confine ourselves strictly to a statement of facts, each one of which can be verified by the reader if he so desires.

Mr. James Hewitson, at Riverside, says:

As to profits of young trees, I have an orchard of navels, four years old this spring, that bore an average of two and one-half boxes to the tree, which have just been sold. My 27½ acres are paying 20 per cent. interest on \$100,000. The old orchard costs \$90 annually for fertilizing and cultivation. There is no place in this State, in the United States, or, I believe, in the world, where such profits in orange culture are made as here in this valley.

Mr. F. P. Morrison, of Redlands, says:

Last year the orchard produced \$300 per acre. Many people are making from two to three times that amount, and this can undoubtedly be done on an average at present prices. But the above estimate takes into consideration any possible decrease in prices. A man owning an orange orchard is sure of a large income with a small amount of light and not disagreeable work.

Mr. B. B. Barney, of Riverside, says:

I commenced to market the fruit at the age of six years, and some parts of the orchard now yield \$1,500 per acre.

Mr. L. M. Holt, editor of the San Bernardino Times-Index, read a paper before the State committee on arid lands, in which he says:

Riverside has 3,000 acres of orange orchard, a portion of which is yielding good crops, a portion of which is yielding partial crops, and a portion is not in bearing at all. These 3,000 acres this year produced 1,000 car-loads of oranges and lemons, worth on the track an average of \$750 a car-load, or \$750,000, about \$250 an acre. This is not picking out sample orchards, but averaging all the orchards whether bearing or not.

When the orchards get into fair bearing they will produce three times as much fruit, or a car-load to the acre, and many of the orchards are doing that now.

These are but a few examples of the abounding prosperity of the California orange-growers, mere examples, and I submit that men who work hard for a dollar and fifty cents a day should not be forced to contribute of their earnings for the protection of these gentlemen. That State sold last year about 800,000 boxes of oranges, and it is said that this year the crop will be one-fourth larger. So much for California and her claim to protection.

In view of the agricultural depression throughout the country in the

staple products, any step toward increasing the profits of orange and lemon growers at the expense of the growers of corn, wheat, and the other ordinary products of agriculture should be taken with great deliberation. What is to justify us in adding to the profits in Florida by subtracting from profits elsewhere? What are the prospects that Florida will soon be able to supply the home demand at reasonable prices? She now claims that 20,000 persons own her orange groves, which cover 250,000 acres, and the product of which, on an average, is 4,000,000 boxes, though last year she marketed only half that quantity.

The gentlemen who appeared before the committee gave a great many statistics of orange culture, a large portion of which are arithmetically inconsistent, but I shall not stop now to examine them. They claim to have 10,000,000 acres of land not now in cultivation for that purpose that is suited to orange growing. It takes at least ten years, we are informed, to grow orange trees, and if, with their present acreage, they are unable to supply the demand even at their own prices, we can not hope to have this acreage increased and the increase producing fruit in less than ten years.

Then are we to deprive our people of all oranges in order that in ten years from now Florida may have the privilege of beginning to supply them, in the mean time charging those who are able to buy at all such prices as the rapacity of the growers or the conditions of the market may compel them to pay? It seems to me that the most that can be asked is that the increased duties shall take effect ten years hence, and in the mean time no one can foresee what conditions may arise to affect the question of public taxation for private benefit. It should be remembered, too, that the production of Florida is very unstable. Frost may destroy the whole crop, or, as last year, there may be only half a crop. The supply is very uncertain and can not be depended upon to meet the demand.

It is urged also by the growers of Florida that new groves are being cultivated in Mexico and other countries, the product of which will in part come to our markets, and that 20,000,000 buds have within the last two years been taken from that State for propagation elsewhere. To this it is enough to reply: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." It will, according to their own statements, take at least ten years to develop these buds into productive trees. We can provide against this evil, if it is an evil, hereafter.

But Florida, like California, is reaping a golden harvest from her production of oranges; and it was unanimously agreed, I believe, by the gentlemen who appeared before the committee, that \$300 per acre is only a fair average income from an acre of orange trees, an amount so much in excess of the income of an acre of ordinary agricultural land that to the average farmer it will appear to be fabulous. I therefore quote an instance of greater profit cited in the Florida Agriculturist:

We know of one grove of 18 acres not far from this place that yielded 7,500 boxes of oranges. Oranges are now selling on the trees for \$1.50 per box. The owner of the grove in question realized more than this, as the fruit was shipped and the risk of transportation, etc., incurred. But estimating the price obtained for the oranges at \$1.50 per box, the crop would yield in cash \$11,250.

And I may here properly say that this is but a common story, the like of which may be found in almost any paper published in either of those new El Dorados, California and Florida.

Under this bill lemons are to be subject to the same duties that are imposed on oranges. Much that I have said about the latter is equally true of the former, and is applicable to many other fruits. The production of lemons in this country is variously estimated at from 25,000 to 100,000 boxes, while our imports amount to from 3,180,000 to 2,300,000 boxes. I know of no reason why the present rates should be increased.

I wish to say that I gladly make this showing of, and pay this tribute to, those magnificent States. They are prosperous and deserve to prosper, and I rejoice over their splendid resources and success. I shall rejoice equally, too, if the people of the whole country shall be allowed to enjoy the privilege of cheap fruit while these States are deriving the bounty that nature has given them in such abundance.

This bill proposes to grant a bounty out of the public Treasury of 2 cents per pound on all sugars polarizing at least 85°, and this new departure is based upon the ground that the domestic production bears such a small proportion to domestic consumption that it is better to promote sugar production by levying a tax on all other industries, to be paid out as a bounty to the sugar producers, than to increase the price of the home product by levying a duty on imported sugar. The objections to this new device are so numerous and so patent that I am not going even to enumerate them. I mention this discrimination between industries for the purpose of calling attention to another and an equally flagrant one.

According to the report of the majority the proportion of home production to home consumption of sugar is about as 1 to 7, and this, they say, is so small that as to this article the protective policy is to be abandoned and a bounty policy substituted. Yet it is proposed to more than double the present duty on tin-plates, of which we produce not a pound in this country, to the end that the production of tin-plates may be begun here. The present rate is 1 cent per pound, and the bill provides that on and after July 1, 1891, this shall be increased to 2.15 cents. The present ad valorem rate is 37.66, and the increase will make it about 80 per cent.

There are employed in the manipulation of tin-plates for their many uses in the various industries of this country about 750,000 laborers and many millions of dollars of capital. In many of these industries the margin of profit is very narrow, and the effect of this bill will be to contract it or wipe it out, reducing the wages of labor or throwing the employes out of work and forcing them and the capital into other lines of production, into agriculture and other industries, to compete with men whose whole lives are now absorbed in a struggle with "the usurer and the sheriff."

We imported last year 5,659,734 boxes of tin, worth \$21,002,209.15, upon which we paid a tax of \$7,279,459.72, and to deprive our roofers, canners, tin-smiths, and others of this cheap supply or to compel them to pay a largely increased price for what they consume will result disastrously to their interests. It will force many to abandon their present occupations, increase the cost of tinware throughout the country, and compel many who continue in their present avocations to resort to the use of substitutes for tin, such as zinc, wood, paper, and glass and earthen ware, the duties on many of which also this bill proposes to increase. And what is the excuse for this? It is to be done for the purpose of allowing a few men to engage at enormous profits in the production of an article not now produced in this country and the production of which has heretofore proved a failure.

The report of the majority tells us that "it is estimated" that the establishment of this industry will give employment to about 24,000 laborers. It is also estimated that it will throw out of employment many times this number; and it should be understood that about 30,000 hands in Wales—poor, pauper, half-starved hands, as the prospective tin-plate-makers here would have us believe—supply the whole world with this product.

Why do not the friends of this bill apply in this case the same specific that they apply in the case of sugar? What they are pleased to set forth as their reasons for giving a bounty on sugar production have much more force as applied to tin-plates. Then, too, why do they not grant bounties on the production of corn, wheat, rye, hay, and other products of the farm, instead of mocking the farmer with higher duties on these articles, to which it is impossible to apply the protective policy beneficially to their producers?

There should be adopted a system at once equitable, uniform, and just, but that purpose this measure ignores entirely. Nothing else can be permanent and any other system will only engender strife and provoke discussion and agitation, to the injury of all concerned.

We have been treated to a view of many inconsistencies in the struggle of the various applicants for bounties and taxes to secure some legalized advantage over their fellow-citizens. The same section of the country that was loudest in its demands for higher duties on tropical fruits was also among the loudest in its opposition to higher rates on leaf-tobacco.

But the cigar-makers have not escaped the blight of this bill. Sumatra leaf, by reason of its peculiarities of size, weight, color, texture, and gloss, has in late years been largely used for wrappers by our cigar-makers. It is, therefore, imported in considerable quantities, and has greatly added to the demand for cigars wrapped in it. The present duties are 75 cents and \$1 per pound, according to whether it is stemmed or unstemmed. This bill proposes to increase the rates to \$2 and \$2.75 per pound, respectively, and it provides that in case any portion of a consignment of leaf-tobacco is suitable for cigar wrappers it shall all be subject to these exorbitant duties.

All other leaf-tobacco is to pay 35 cents if unstemmed and 50 cents if stemmed. It was stated by gentlemen before the committee that without a test, which it is impracticable for the custom-house inspectors to make, it is impossible to distinguish between leaf suitable for wrappers and that suitable for other purposes only, and that in every lot of leaf imported some portion, however small, will always be found answering, in the eyes of the inspectors at least, the description of cigar wrappers, so that the effect of this provision of the bill will be to subject all leaf to the payment of these prohibitive duties, thus depriving our cigar manufacturers not only of the Sumatra leaf for wrappers, but of the Havana leaf for fillers, and the effect of this will be nothing less than ruinous to a large industry now employing thousands upon thousands of workmen, who are earning good wages and supporting their families from an occupation requiring a peculiar skill, which they have acquired in years of practice.

In addition to and aggravation of all this, the duties on Havana cigars are so arranged and adjusted as to make it more profitable to manufacture them elsewhere and export them to this country than to make them here with the proposed rates on leaf-tobacco. It may be some satisfaction to the advocates of this measure to know that when thrown out of work here our cigar-makers may find employment in Cuba and elsewhere in the West Indies, and from those islands continue to supply the trade of a country from which they shall have been expatriated, but it may well be doubted that they will ever be able to reconcile this large class of workmen to such treatment at the hands of the Government to which they have been taught that they might look for equal consideration and a full measure of justice. [Applause.]

The purpose possibly is, as some gentlemen claim, to prohibit the importation of only this Sumatra leaf; but by reason of our treaty relations with the country to which Sumatra belongs we are unable ex-

pressly to discriminate against this particular tobacco, and therefore the makers of cigars must be subjected to this ruinous provision that a few growers of wrapper leaf in this country may sell their inferior product at an enhanced price. It is another unwarranted interference of the Government with the tastes, aptitudes, and occupations of the people. It will throw many persons out of employment and sacrifice large interests to the greed of a few growers of a kind of tobacco that consumers do not desire to purchase, and it is extremely doubtful if it will result in a benefit to even this small class of the people.

One of the grossest injustices in our tariff laws, aggravated and perpetuated in this bill, is the imposition of the highest rates of duty on the commonest classes of goods, by reason of which the heaviest rates of taxation are levied on that portion of our people the least able to bear them. Every schedule in the law and in this bill has its examples of this injustice, and the whole may be well illustrated by the cutlery and fire-arms paragraphs in the metal schedule. There, by classifying the articles according to value and levying compound duties, the purchasers of the lowest-priced of each class are compelled to pay the highest rates. For instance, double-barreled shotguns are classified into those costing not more than \$6, more than \$6 and not more than \$12, and those costing more than the last-named amount.

These classes are subjected to duties of \$2, \$4, and \$6 per gun, respectively, and in addition, 35 per cent. ad valorem. On the first or lowest-priced of these classes the duties range from less than 70 to more than 100 per cent.; on the second class, about the same; and on the third class, from the lowest rates on the highest-priced guns that are made to over 90 per cent. on the lowest cost of that class. And so it is with cutlery, clothing, and everything else upon which a specific duty is laid until the man of small means is so discriminated against that his purchases are generally restricted to the barest necessities of life.

In addition to the changes made in duties on imported goods by this bill, and the increases made by the reimposition of duties on packages, etc., by the customs administrative bill, the revenue is affected by the provision reducing the internal tax on tobacco from 8 to 4 cents per pound. Here again, whatever may be thought concerning the repeal of taxes on liquors and tobacco, while retaining exorbitant rates on the food, clothing, shelter, and implements of industry used by the people (and there seems to be a difference of opinion on that subject), it is not easy to see why the tobacco tax should be reduced while all the inquisitorial machinery for its collection is retained.

The objection to the internal-revenue system is, mainly, that it necessitates a system of espionage that is distasteful to the people and cumbersome in operation, a system by which the citizen is subjected to unreasonable arrest, fine, and imprisonment, and his business to pernicious governmental supervision. These objections are neither removed nor modified by the reduction of the tax, but the only effect of that reduction is to decrease the revenue and increase the proportionate cost of its collection. In this respect the bill is objectionable and has no redeeming feature.

In this discussion, instead of going into a review of the policy of protection, I have confined myself within the narrow limits of a few items of the present bill, items fairly illustrative, however, of its general character. It is one of the most objectionable measures, in my estimation, that have ever been offered as a solution of the tariff question, a bill relieving few burdens, creating new ones, and adding to those that already exist; and what I have said upon it, though not comprehensive, is enough to bring us to a full appreciation of the legend that was found pinned to the corpse of a victim of Judge Lynch in a Western Territory: "He was a pretty mean man in some respects, but he was a blamed sight worse in others."

That is about my estimate of this measure, and at the proper time I shall offer amendments aimed at some of its evils. If it becomes a law in its present shape it will destroy many industries, throw out of employment the men engaged in some, and work a reduction of wages in nearly all. It will tend to restrict trade in every seaport town and to drive American commerce from the ocean, and will force to an earlier issue that just and equitable revision and reduction of the tariff that the people demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have eighteen minutes of my time remaining, which I will reserve to be occupied to-morrow by my colleague [Mr. FITCH].

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYSON reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize the duties on imports, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

MCKINLEY. I move that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that leave be given to all members to print in the RECORD remarks on House bill No. 9416, known as the "tariff bill." I also ask unanimous consent that to-morrow morning the House meet at 11 o'clock, instead of 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] that general leave to print remarks on the tariff bill be given? The Chair hears no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio also asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-night it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires permission to lay before the House some business that ought not to be delayed.

EXPORTS OF BREADSTUFFS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

In answer to the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 31, 1890, respecting the importation into foreign countries of breadstuffs and provisions from the United States and the rates of duty imposed upon such articles, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State on the subject, together with the accompanying papers.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 8, 1890.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HUDSON, N. Y.

The bill (S. 1306) for the erection of a public building at Hudson, N. Y., was laid before the House by the Speaker, having been returned from the Senate with the notification that the amendment of the House was disagreed to and a conference asked.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I move that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

HELEN PLUNKETT.

The bill (S. 1221) granting a pension to Helen Plunkett was laid before the House by the Speaker, having been returned from the Senate with the notification that the amendment of the House was disagreed to and a conference asked.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate? In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

RIGHT OF WAY ACROSS MILLE LACS INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7754) granting right of way to the Little Falls, Mille Lacs and Lake Superior Railway across the Mille Lacs Indian reservation, the bill having been returned from the Senate with amendments and a request for a conference with the House on the bill and amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate and agree to the request for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

WALTER P. HARRISON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, May 7, 1890.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2598) increasing the pension of Walter P. Harrison.

The SPEAKER. The question is on complying with the request of the Senate. In the absence of objection, the bill will be returned as requested.

There was no objection.

BARENT S. VAN BUREN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of Barent S. Van Buren, returned from the Senate by request of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands this to be a duplicate bill, and without objection it will be destroyed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (S. 859) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.;

A bill (S. 903) for the erection of a public building in Cedar Rapids, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 1015) to provide for town-site entries of lands in what is known as "Oklahoma," and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2304) to establish two additional land districts in the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 3472) for improving Aransas Pass; and

A bill (H. R. 9548) providing for the classification of worsted cloths as woolsens.

Mr. MOORE, of New Hampshire, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 606) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at La Fayette, in the State of Indiana;
 A bill (S. 948) for the relief of Laban Heath & Co., of Boston, Massachusetts; and
 A bill (S. 954) authorizing the construction of a public building at Burlington, Iowa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
 To Mr. BLANCHARD, for ten days, on account of important business.
 To Mr. SPOONER, until Monday next.
 To Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, for one week, on account of important business.
 To Mr. O'DONNELL indefinitely, on account of important business.

CAIRO, PORT OF DELIVERY.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6778) to provide for the establishment of a port of delivery at Cairo, in the county of Alexander, in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.
 The bill was read at length.

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

Mr. DOCKERY. We have no information whatever upon this question, but I believe this bill provides for a new office. I would ask the gentleman if it has been reported from any committee.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. It has been reported from the committee and recommended by the Department.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think, as it creates a new office, I would like to know more about it before consent is given to its passage in this manner.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think we might consider this bill now; and if consent is given to its consideration I will move to strike out Cairo and insert Springfield. In that shape I think it ought to pass. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Well, I could hardly agree to that amendment of my colleague.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let it go over so we can have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. I will state to the gentleman that the report is short and can be read if he desires it. It is recommended by the Department and is needed in that section of the country.

Mr. McMILLIN. But it creates a new office, and I want to see the necessity for it before giving my consent.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Would you not be willing to have the report read, then?

Mr. McMILLIN. I have no objection to that if the gentleman desires it; but I think the bill should go over.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Very well; I will see if I can find objection to some other bill in the future.

Mr. McMILLIN. I want to look into the necessity for this office.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Very well; then I will ask that it be considered in the morning.

Mr. McMILLIN. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." I would rather not have it pending.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. Then I ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. But the difficulty is that the request of the gentleman from Illinois requires unanimous consent, and the gentleman from Tennessee declines to give that.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois. All right; then I will just hold the grudge against the gentleman in the future.

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. McMILLIN. So far as charging what may be done in the future is concerned, I have no objection to the gentleman pleasing himself, if he chooses to adopt that course. I am not afraid of it.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE AT EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. Before submitting the motion of the gentleman from Ohio, the Chair will state that he has appointed the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] to preside as Speaker pro tempore at this evening's session.

The motion of Mr. MCKINLEY was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session, Mr. PERKINS in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

TARIFF.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 9416.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOPKINS in the chair.

Mr. SIMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I have not risen for the discussion of any broad questions connected with the tariff and certainly not

for purposes of declamation. The bill under consideration has in it some matters of such intense and even painful interest to a large body of the people whom I endeavor to represent on this floor that any indulgence in mere rhetoric upon such matters would seem to them like cruel mockery.

It will have been noticed by those who have read the bill under discussion attentively, as well as by those who followed the luminous exposition which was made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MCKINLEY], that the bill proposes a sharp increase in the tariff duties on tobacco and a considerable decrease in the internal-revenue taxation upon that article. What is transpiring among my own people in regard to this matter is well illustrated by a little newspaper clipping which I hold in my hand and which appeared in the Hartford Courant of last Monday morning, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TOBACCO-RAISING—EFFECT OF LOW PRICES ON LAND—AN INCIDENT IN POINT.

The East Hartford correspondent of The Courant writes as follows: "The past year has been an exceptionally hard one with farmers, especially with those who raise tobacco, and it affects not only the farmer direct, but many other classes who are interested in farm property. A fine farm in the north district was sold nineteen years ago for \$8,000. Last week the same farm was sold for \$4,000, or \$200 less than the first mortgage, right in the face, too, of the horse railroad, which will terminate only about half a mile from this location. "Nineteen years ago tobacco was selling for 50 cents per pound, now for 14 cents per pound, which accounts for the low prices of farm property in a measure. During the past week a poor farmer from South Windsor loaded up his crop of tobacco and started for the warehouse of Rosenwald Bros., E. O. Goodwin, agent, East Hartford. When near the residence of T. E. Bancroft, East Windsor Hill, Mr. Bancroft had the audacity to ask him what he got for his crop of tobacco which had the appearance of being very fine. Contrary to the usual custom the poor fellow humbly told him 14 cents per pound delivered. 'I will give you that if you will dump it in my door yard,' said Mr. Bancroft. The farmer quickly accepted the offer and unloaded, leaving the big warehouse one load short."

Mr. SIMONDS. It will be seen from this newspaper clipping that a constituent of mine sold as a fertilizer an entire wagon-load of tobacco of a good quality such as nineteen or twenty years ago he would have received 50 cents a pound for. It is easily to be seen from such an instance as this that the people of the First Congressional district of Connecticut have good reason to take a deep and even a painful interest in the bill under consideration. Although the question is of such a peculiar interest to the people of my district, it is by no means a local question.

What duties, both of excise and customs, shall be levied upon tobacco and its manufactures is most thoroughly a national question, probably more so than is generally supposed. Nearly every State in this great Union of States has a vital interest in this question.

As long ago as 1879 thirty-five States and Territories made notable contributions to the tobacco crop, which had increased 80 per cent. in ten years. I have gathered from the census report of 1880 a list of thirty-five counties, each in a separate State or Territory, which contributed to that crop, the extremes being Bonhomme County, in Dakota, with 1,057 pounds, and Lancaster County, in Pennsylvania, with 23,946,326 pounds.

Table showing thirty-five counties in separate States and Territories contributing to the tobacco crop of 1879.

States.	Counties.	Pounds.
Alabama	Madison County	36,356
Arkansas	Benton County	395,982
California	San Benito County	59,100
Connecticut	Hartford County	9,039,514
Dakota	Bonhomme County	1,057
Florida	Gadsden County	6,697
Georgia	Cherokee County	17,900
Illinois	Saline County	785,897
Indiana	Warrick County	3,253,323
Iowa	Decatur County	27,238
Kansas	Chautauque County	11,345
Kentucky	Christian County	12,577,574
Louisiana	St. James Parish	14,680
Maryland	Prince George's County	6,575,246
Massachusetts	Hampshire County	2,305,442
Michigan	Monroe County	5,757
Minnesota	Houston County	6,253
Mississippi	Tippah County	25,127
Missouri	Charlton County	4,384,924
Nebraska	Otoe County	10,095
Nevada	Washoe County	1,500
New Hampshire	Cheshire County	141,218
New Jersey	Burlington County	94,487
New York	Onondaga County	2,316,257
North Carolina	Granville County	4,606,358
Ohio	Montgomery County	9,314,372
Oregon	Lane County	5,149
Pennsylvania	Lancaster County	23,946,326
South Carolina	Greenville County	9,638
Tennessee	Montgomery County	8,266,461
Texas	Lamar County	15,003
Vermont	Windham County	127,219
Virginia	Pittsylvania County	12,271,533
West Virginia	Fayette County	253,460
Wisconsin	Dane County	5,371,242

In the same year, 1879, there were sixteen States which contributed substantially 1,000,000 pounds or more to the tobacco crop, the ex-

Armed being Arkansas, with 970,220 pounds, and Kentucky, with 171,120,784 pounds.

Sixteen States contributing to the tobacco crop of 1879.

State	Pounds.
Arkansas	970,220
Connecticut	14,044,652
Illinois	3,935,825
Indiana	8,872,842
Kentucky	171,120,784
Maryland	26,082,147
Massachusetts	5,369,436
Missouri	12,015,657
New York	6,481,431
North Carolina	26,986,213
Ohio	34,735,235
Pennsylvania	36,943,272
Tennessee	29,365,052
Virginia	79,988,865
West Virginia	2,296,146
Wisconsin	10,608,423

In the Report on the Culture and Curing of Tobacco, which forms a part of the census report of 1880, Special Agent Killebrew says, on page 23:

More than a hundred varieties of the tobacco plant are named in the schedules returned to this office.

And he says, on page xi, in his letter of transmittal:

It is believed that the soil and climate of Florida are more specially adapted to the growing of tobacco with the fragrance and texture of Cuba tobacco than those of any other part of the United States. Enough has been done in this State to show that, with proper selection of varieties and intelligent culture and management, a product of most excellent quality closely approximating that of Cuba can be grown upon a large extent of its territory.

Given in 1879 this vast area adapted to the production of more than a hundred different varieties of tobacco, including practically the Cuban article; given in that year a crop of 471,500,000 pounds—an increase of 80 per cent. as compared with 1869—produced from thirty-five different States and Territories, with sixteen States in the million-producing column; given living upon this vast area the most rapidly growing population in the world, a people of wonderful versatility, energy, and enterprise, nothing else could reasonably have been expected to happen in the next ten years other than a vast increase in the production, with a resulting degree of prosperity to the producers and to the nation at large.

What are the facts? Not only has no State been added to the sixteen originally in the million-producing column, but the production in all States except those sixteen has practically ceased. The facts as to these sixteen States are given in a table furnished me by Professor J. R. Dodge, Statistician of the Agricultural Department, which gives the product in each State from 1879 to 1888, inclusive.

Product of tobacco by States, 1879-1888.

CIGAR LEAF.

[The product for 1879 and 1888 is given in full; for the other years in millions (and million-tenths) of pounds only]

State.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.
Connecticut	14,044,652	15.4	13.7	9.7	9.5	9.4	12.0	11.6	9.1	9,608,000
Massachusetts	5,369,436	4.9	5.0	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.2	3.5	3,893,000
New York	6,481,431	6.5	6.2	9.7	9.0	8.1	10.2	7.5	7.6	6,488,000
Pennsylvania	36,943,272	34.8	38.8	31.0	36.3	34.1	23.3	34.9	40.2	24,180,000
Wisconsin	10,608,423	11.3	8.7	10.4	5.7	14.3	31.1	23.7	11.2	12,846,000
All other	657,347	.5	.5	.5	.1	.1				
Total	74,104,560	73.3	73.1	65.8	64.8	69.9	80.6	82.1	71.7	57,010,000

MANUFACTURING LEAF.

State.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.
Illinois	3,935,825	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.1	3.9	4.9	6.1	1.4	2,947,000
Maryland	26,082,147	18.8	25.8	29.2	31.5	31.2	28.5	25.2	26.6	14,017,000
North Carolina	26,986,213	35.7	24.8	32.2	29.0	34.8	37.4	31.5	29.1	25,755,000
Virginia	79,988,865	78.4	77.6	89.2	67.8	99.7	107.7	91.1	79.4	64,034,000
Arkansas	970,220	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.6	2.1	1.2	1,156,000
Kentucky	171,120,784	149.0	163.0	198.9	171.0	208.6	209.4	193.9	115.8	283,306,000
Missouri	12,015,657	11.0	12.2	10.5	15.8	14.5	11.9	6.4	6.4	13,109,000
Ohio	34,735,235	38.4	35.4	33.6	29.9	29.3	33.7	35.3	19.2	35,195,000
Tennessee	29,365,052	24.3	22.1	31.0	28.5	31.3	26.9	31.7	26.2	45,641,000
West Virginia	2,296,146	2.8	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.2	4,496,000
All other	2,187,608	2.8	1.4	16.5	3.4	3.6	4.7	3.5	2.8	2,276,000
Total	398,556,597	373.0	376.7	447.2	386.6	471.5	482.0	450.3	314.4	508,785,000
Grand total	472,661,157	446.2	449.8	513.0	451.5	451.5	562.7	532.5	386.2	565,795,000

The results illustrated in this table can be readily summarized. Cigar leaf, which costs more to produce than any other and is the highest priced of any, is raised in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. The product of cigar leaf fell off from 74,000,000 pounds in 1879 to 57,000,000 in 1888, and this loss, coupled with an even greater loss in price, although the quality has improved, has been a disaster of great severity for the entire cigar-leaf industry.

In four States which produce manufacturing leaf, for smoking and chewing purposes—Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia—the production fell off from 136,000,000 pounds in 1879 to 105,000,000 in 1888. In Arkansas, another State which produces manufacturing leaf, the increase from 972,220 pounds in 1879 to 1,156,000 in 1888 is hardly substantial enough for mention.

In the remaining six tobacco States, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and West Virginia, which produce manufacturing leaf, there was an apparent increase from 258,000,000 pounds, in 1879, to 397,000,000, in 1888, but that this was not a regular and normal increase is shown by the fact that a comparison of 1879 with 1887 gives exactly opposite results, the product in 1879 being 258,000,000 pounds against 173,000,000 in 1887.

From all this it clearly appears that while the manufacturing-leaf districts have suffered vastly less than the cigar-leaf districts, the tobacco-growing industry has suffered along the whole line and has utterly failed to fulfill its manifest destiny.

Such trouble as the growers of manufacturing leaf have experienced is sufficiently accounted for by excessive internal-revenue tax, which handicaps production by increasing cost and impeding exportation; this fact is sufficiently shown by a table furnished me by Professor Dodge, of the Agricultural Department, giving the exports of domestic leaf from 1880 to 1888, inclusive. Practically, these exports are all manufacturing leaf. We export substantially no cigar leaf and we import substantially no manufacturing leaf.

Exports of domestic leaf-tobacco, 1880-1888.

Year.	Pounds.	Year.	Pounds.
1880	225,737,776	1885	278,130,130
1881	218,244,205	1886	304,048,818
1882	225,525,793	1887	247,991,111
1883	239,584,814	1888	204,184,021
1884	195,652,539		

This table shows that we exported 225,737,000 pounds of manufacturing leaf in 1880 and only 204,184,000 in 1888; and the conditions are such that excessive internal-revenue taxation accounts for the loss.

By far the sorest trouble of all has fallen upon the growers of cigar leaf, who are to be found in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. I have already pointed out that the production of cigar leaf fell off from 74,000,000 pounds in 1879 to 57,000,000 in 1888, and it is in ample evidence before the Ways and Means Committee that while the quality has improved the price has fallen off even more than the product.

Fortunately or unfortunately the reasons for this are as clear as daylight. The growers of cigar leaf have had to contend not only with excessive internal-revenue taxation, but with Chinese labor, costing only a few cents a day, exploited by Dutch capital in unlimited amounts. The increase in the imports of cigar leaf and its manufactures from 1880 to 1889 is shown, in a general way, by a table furnished me by Mr. S. G. Brock, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department.

Imports of tobacco and cigars, 1880-1889.

Year.	Leaf.	Cigars.
	Pounds.	Pounds.
1880	9,759,355	659,402
1881	7,468,664	618,503
1882	11,899,823	802,873
1883	14,593,131	829,777
1884	12,955,017	891,769

Imports of tobacco and cigars, 1880-1889—Continued.

Year.	Leaf.	Cigars.
	Pounds.	Pounds.
1885.....	12,924,265	919,984
1886.....	15,695,670	1,016,033
1887.....	17,519,194	1,115,491
1888.....	18,600,142	1,153,468
1889.....	20,106,881	1,232,619

The imports of cigar leaf have risen from 9,759,355 pounds in 1880 to 20,106,881 pounds in 1889, and the imports of cigars have risen from 650,402 pounds in 1880 to 1,232,619 pounds in 1889. There is a portion of this of which the cigar-leaf-growers do not complain. The leaf which makes fillers and binders for cigars comes mainly from Cuba and the leaf which makes wrappers comes mainly from Sumatra. Our cigar-leaf-growers do not complain especially of the Cuban imports, but they do complain most bitterly of the imports of Sumatra leaf, the astonishing development of which is shown by a table furnished me by Mr. S. G. Brock, chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department.

Imports of Sumatra tobacco—1880-1889.

Year.	Pounds.	
	1880-1889	1885-1889
1880.....	38	2,217,917
1881.....	200,602	4,000,519
1882.....	782,763	4,213,472
1883.....	3,818,931	5,861,472
1884.....	603,536	5,024,455

This table makes the astonishing disclosure that the imports of Sumatra tobacco rose from 38 pounds in 1880 to about 6,000,000 in 1888. One pound of these Sumatra wrappers covers as many cigars as 3 or 4 pounds of American wrappers. We have seen that from 1879 to 1888 the home production of cigar leaf fell off 17,000,000 pounds. The 6,000,000 pounds of Sumatra wrappers displace somewhere from eighteen to twenty-four million pounds of American wrappers. That Sumatra wrappers have just filled the seventeen millions gap in American production, with something over for the natural increase in the product of cigars, is clearly apparent. The two things go together with the sequence of cause and effect.

Now, the Sumatra wrapper is by no means the equal of the American article in smoking quality, for it is bitter to the taste and it does not burn so well as the American wrapper. It is not fit to make an entire cigar of; no one ever heard of an "all Sumatra" cigar and no one ever will; the gamins of the street would spurn such a thing after a single experience. I have made some extracts from the evidence before the Ways and Means Committee upon this point.

TESTIMONY BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

J. S. Van Duzer:

I ought to speak of the merits claimed for this Sumatran tobacco. * * * The tobacco is not pleasant to the taste, and the only advantage that can reasonably be claimed for it, so far as the smoker is concerned, is that it is more glossy than either the Havana or domestic wrapper.

M. Tobin, president New York Tobacco-Growers' Association:

It is acknowledged to this day that, so far as quality is concerned, the American tobacco is infinitely superior to its foreign rival.

N. S. Pomeroy:

It is a conceded fact by all tobacco men, including cigar manufacturers, who are its strongest advocates, that a cigar made from clear Sumatra tobacco would not be smoked by the most degraded smoker. No manufacturer dare make them and put them on the market; they would drive the people out of the house. Please ask some of its manufacturing defenders why they do not advertise clear Sumatra cigars. The fact is that every ounce of Sumatra wrapper that is put on a thousand cigars deteriorates their quality.

The real reasons why manufacturers want it are these: It produces a more glossy and handsome surface for a cigar-wrapper than domestic tobacco, and the manufacturers can perpetrate frauds upon the smoking community that they can not with domestic tobacco. It has a peculiar rankness that overpowers the taste of the filler, consequently the manufacturer can fill the cigar with any kind of trash, flavored a little, and with a Sumatra wrapper the average smoker can not tell what it is made of.

F. R. Diffenderfer, secretary of the Pennsylvania Tobacco-Growers' Association:

I wish to distinctly impress upon this committee the very important fact that while the major portion of the Sumatran importations come into this country under the filler rate, there are no Sumatran fillers brought here at all. They are utterly worthless for cigar-making purposes. The street gamin, who gets all his smoking from the stumps he fishes out of the gutter, would turn away with infinite scorn from the offer of a cigar made solely of Sumatran tobacco. * * * The Sumatra tobacco is bitter. We can not smoke it at all. We have to disguise the outside wrapper by putting on binders.

W. C. Morse:

No one has ever attempted to controvert the assertion that Sumatra has no quality whatever as a smoke. It is bitter, but it is glossy and bright and fine in texture; but unless it can get the aroma from our own tobacco, it is utterly impossible to use it.

"If Sumatra tobacco be thus inferior to the American article, why is it used?" is a question proper to be asked. The reason is that, mechanically considered, it is as perfect a thing for a cigar wrapper as if it were woven by a machine specially invented and designed for that purpose. It is thin; so thin that a pound of it displaces from three to four pounds of American wrappers; it has a smooth surface and it is glossy. As one

of the largest dealers in Washington said to me not long ago, it is used simply because it makes a "pretty" cigar, and that is the whole story. This singular stuff is all raised in Sumatra, an island divided by the equator and lying directly off the southeast coast of China. This island is reported upon in Consular Report No. 107 $\frac{1}{2}$, and I have made extracts from the reports.

CONSULAR REPORTS.

On "Eastern Sumatra," by Consul A. G. Studer:

When the crop is matured each coolie cuts what he has planted, carries it to and delivers it at the drying-shed, where it is examined and classified into four or even five classes, the poor coolie having no voice in the planter's decision of classifying, namely, very good, good, fair, middling, and inferior; and he is allowed so much (a figure mentioned in the contract) per thousand trees of each class. When the tobacco-planting stock companies declare annually from 100 to 120 per cent. dividends, as, per statements in the papers never contradicted, they have done for years, one can not help but know how outrageously unjustly the poor "siukies" must have been dealt with.

It is awful to think and ponder over it. Only a few weeks ago I read in two or three local and other Eastern papers that the Arendsburg Tobacco-Planting Company in Deli had declared 120 per cent. dividend for last year. The planting rates used to range, only a few years ago, from about \$4 for the lowest to \$10 for the best per thousand trees (not dollars in gold, but Mexican silver), and as a coolie rarely can plant over nine thousand trees of one crop, and has to clear, burn, and hoe the ground, transplant and cultivate, cut and carry in the tobacco, and find himself, including expenses from the time he left China, one can count at his fingers' ends the handsome balance that will be due him from the planter.

On Sumatra, by Vice-Consul H. G. Wood:

The industry is at present largely in the hands of Dutch planters, who have been attracted by the excellence of the climate and fertility of the soil and by the facilities afforded for acquiring land. There are now about forty contractors, who are, with few exceptions, Dutchmen and backed by capital from Holland, though several companies were also formed with English capital, and some even with a combination of both.

On East Coast of Sumatra, by Consul Lederer:

After the rough preparation of the soil the young tobacco plants, which have been grown in nurseries from seeds, are planted in the open field. The laborers employed are all Chinese coolies, and each coolie receives a field for planting, the working of which he has to look after solely. The coolies all live on the estate, in light wooden sheds, in gangs of eight to ten men. Each gang has its overseer, also of Chinese origin, and from five to ten gangs are superintended by a European assistant, or the manager himself if the estate is small. A middle-sized estate cultivates about 350 to 400 fields per year, employs about an equal number of field coolies, besides about fifty to one hundred Javanese, Boyans, and Malays, who are used for building sheds, sorting tobacco, etc.

The field coolies are paid by the quantity and quality they deliver to the shed. By quality is understood the size and general appearance of the leaves. The leaf is generally ranged under four categories: First length of leaf, 15 inches or more; second length of leaf, 12 to 15 inches; third length of leaf, 9 to 12 inches; fourth length of leaf, less than 9 inches. For 1,000 plants of first length the coolie gets paid \$8 (Mexican); for the other inferior lengths less in proportion. A good coolie produces about 15,000 good plants in his field, for which he gets paid extra at the rate of 20 to 30 cents (Mexican) per diem.

In order to prevent the hung-up plants from getting rotten or mildewed during the process of drying, constant small smoke-fires are kept burning in the shed. After a few weeks, when the plants are quite dry, they are taken down and all the leaves cut off the stalks. The stalks are used as manure in the fields. The leaves are sorted by the coolies on five categories, namely, first, second, third, and fourth lengths, and one for broken leaf. They are tied in bundles of about sixty leaves each. For this work they are paid \$4 (Mexican) per 1,000 bundles.

A good working coolie can pick and sort as much as 2,000 bundles per month, and the sorting takes about three months. * * * For the work in the curing shed, which is always under the direct supervision of the manager and some European assistants, Chinese and Javanese coolies are employed and they get paid by the day 20 cents (Mexican) per man. Some estates also employ for this work Javanese women, who work cheaper, although the work is not equally good as that performed by the men. The women receive 10 cents per working day.

Translating Mexican dollars into the currency of the world, the Sumatra rates for labor are, upon an average, 15.8 cents per day. As similar American field labor costs \$1.50 per day, and sorting costs \$2.75 per day, it results that the American wages are, on an average, 1243 per cent. higher than the Chinese. The coolie works "by the piece," so that he must do his best or starve; the work in both countries is hand work, and if any one doubts the ability of the Chinaman to do as much work in the same time as an American, where simple manual dexterity is concerned, he can satisfy himself upon that point by watching one of the Chinese laundrymen here in Washington for a few minutes.

Until 1883 the duty at our ports upon Sumatra tobacco was only 35 cents a pound; since 1883 it has been 75 cents a pound upon unstemmed wrappers and 30 per cent. ad valorem upon other unstemmed tobacco. The average price of Sumatra imports in 1888 and 1889, judging by custom-house valuations, is 91 cents a pound, and these rates represent ad valorem duties of 30 per cent. and 82 per cent., respectively. In the face of a difference in labor cost of 1243 per cent. these duties of 30 and 82 per cent. have been, of course, mere barriers of air against the flood of Sumatra.

Cheap, very cheap, Chinese labor is not the only enemy with which the growers of cigar leaf have had to contend. Tormented by competition with cheap labor to a degree unknown to any other American industry, they have been subjected to an additional torment of home manufacture. This home-made torment is excessive internal-revenue taxation upon cigar leaf and its manufactures. To what extent this torment operates can be seen by examining its operations in 1888.

Year 1888.

Value of home crop of cigar leaf.....	\$6,321,202
Value of leaf imported for home consumption.....	9,963,276
Add average tariff of 60 per cent.....	5,977,965
	22,262,443

Internal-revenue tax on cigars and cheroots.....	\$11,534,179
Internal-revenue tax on cigarettes.....	931,363
Special tax on dealers in leaf (one-fourth of).....	11,247
Special tax on cigar manufacturers.....	116,398
	12,593,187

The internal-revenue tax is 56 per cent. of the value of all the material used. Is it any wonder that, even with every possible favorable condition of soil and climate, our tobacco-growing industry, competing with the Chinese labor under a difference of 1243 per cent., and with 56 per cent. of internal-revenue taxation at home, is languishing in the cigar-leaf districts, and that the farmers of those districts are sending up a distressed and bitter cry? That is a question which conclusively answers itself.

Chapter seven of the internal-revenue laws is interesting reading for American freemen.

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER VII, INTERNAL-REVENUE LAW.

Section 3387 provides for an inventory of a man and his belongings, with a bond of \$500 and upwards that he will comply with the multifarious provisions of the revenue acts; it provides a fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment for five years, and if he fails to hang up a certificate that he shall be fined \$100.

Section 3388 provides that if he does not hang out a certain sign he may be fined \$500.

Section 3390 provides for certain minute returns of daily business with a fine of \$5,000 and imprisonment for three years.

Section 3392 provides that if he does not put his cigars in boxes of certain sizes he may be fined \$1,000 and imprisoned two years.

Section 3393 provides that if he does not put a certain stamp upon each box he shall be fined \$50 for every such box.

Section 3394 provides for a tax of \$3 per thousand on cigars and 50 cents a thousand upon cigarettes.

Section 3397 provides that if he moves cigars from one building to another without first boxing, stamping, and branding them he may be fined \$1,000 and imprisoned two years; it also provides for another fine of \$1,000 and three years of imprisonment, in the same connection.

Section 3398 provides that cigars not bearing certain stamps shall be forfeited.

Section 3399 provides that when one person hires another to make cigars, then for failure to do certain things a fine of \$5,000 may be imposed, with imprisonment for three years.

Section 3400 provides, in addition to the other penalties, that if a cigar-maker fails to do all the things which the law says he shall do, that shall work a forfeiture of his stock, tools, machinery, buildings, and land.

Section 3401 provides that if a cigar-maker represents his cigars as made prior to a certain date, when they were not so made, he may be fined \$5,000 and imprisoned three years.

Section 3404 provides that a person who buys any cigar not bearing a certain stamp shall be fined \$50.

Section 3405 provides that any one who buys cigars which have not paid the special tax shall be fined \$100 and forfeit his purchase.

Section 3406 provides a fine of \$50 and imprisonment for six months for not destroying the stamps upon a box when it is emptied of cigars. And for him who gives or accepts such a box it provides a fine of \$100 and imprisonment for a year.

No words can add any force to the bare statement of the provisions of this chapter.

Since these taxes are levied upon dealers and manufacturers, "How," it may be asked, "are the farmers injured thereby?" The answer is this: A man can not become a dealer in leaf-tobacco except by taking a license and paying a tax; a man can not become a cigar manufacturer without giving a bond of \$500 and upwards with sureties and then doing business enough to pay for the keeping of a skilled book-keeper. These provisions have made the business of cigar-manufacturing a monopoly protected by law, a monopoly which restricts the number of the farmers' customers by more than one-half and a monopoly which enables the cigar manufacturers to force the farmers to sell the product of their fields at such prices as the manufacturers choose to name.

No one understands this situation better than the manufacturers do. They do not desire the abolition of internal-revenue taxation upon tobacco. They are such singularly patriotic citizens that they are praying for the retention of the tax. This spectacle alone of a class of men praying to be taxed is proof as conclusive as Holy Writ that the system yields them a wicked advantage. These are the same gentlemen who are asking that there shall be no import stamp upon cigars brought from abroad, so that they may deceive the dear public effectually and with impunity. It can not be that the tobacco farmers can apply to this House in vain against this enormity. [Applause.]

There is no better and no more intelligent class of citizens in the world than those who are now applying for protection against Chinese labor and against the home-made torment of an internal-revenue tax. Directly across the Connecticut River from the city of Hartford there is a sample group of these people. There you may find a plot of land some eighteen miles long and four miles wide, fair and fertile as the sun ever shone on, wholly devoted to this industry. Its homes are so near together that you never lose sight of one as you travel its elm-

shaded roads. The lawns are shaven by the mower and "the climbing roses blossom by the door." The daily newspaper, the scientific periodical, and all the other things which these imply are to be found within.

Mr. F. A. Schroeder, the Sumatra apostle, said, in his remarks before the Ways and Means Committee, they have "sent their daughters to boarding-school and their sons to college." They have done these things, but they are doing them no more. With millions upon millions invested in land and in buildings and appliances specially adapted to this industry, with a scientific care and culture applied to this industry such as was never before applied to any other branch of agriculture in the history of the world, for ten years, and more, their life blood has been wrung from them as by the grip of a relentless fate, only to be transmuted into gold for the coffers of rich merchants in Amsterdam and for the coffers of the manufacturers at home, who so dearly love the blessings of internal-revenue taxation. It is in behalf of such constituents as these that I appeal to you, and I can not, in common justice, appeal in vain. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago, about 1 o'clock in the afternoon, the chairman of the Committee on Rules reported to the House the following resolution:

Resolved, That to-day, after the passage of this resolution, the House consider Senate bill No. 389, for which House bill No. 8297 may be offered as a substitute, and that the previous question be considered as ordered to the passage, at 4 o'clock, on the bill and all pending amendments.

The bill referred to in the resolution was known as the dependent pension bill. It was an important measure, and a deep interest was felt and manifested in it by every member of the House. The bill was not satisfactory to the soldiers of the country and it involved an annual appropriation of \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000. It was evident that in the time proposed, not above three hours at most, no fair or general discussion of the measure could be had and no opportunity offered for amending the bill. Indeed, it had been decreed in the Republican caucus on the night previous that this should be thus, and the House had nothing left to do but witness the execution of the decree of the caucus. Virtually the bill was passed the night before. How much opportunity for discussion or power of influencing the measure the members of the House were suffered to exert may be gathered from a passage in this speech made by the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. MCKINLEY]. In the course of his remarks he said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we want is to do the public business of the country. Talk about "considering." When you were in control of this House you "considered" and did nothing. We "consider" and we do something. [Applause on the Republican side.] What we want and what the country wants is results, not speeches. [Renewed applause.]

These remarks were made with great earnestness and were greeted with applause on the Republican side. I call attention to this matter because, in my opinion, it marks an epoch in the history of this legislative body. It signals the final and complete triumph of the caucus system and puts an end to deliberate, open, and free discussion of public questions. This is the pith of the new plan. We are to "do business." We are not to have any more speeches. Discussion is not in harmony with the new methods of procedure; besides, agitation is dangerous. It threatens the stability of established favoritism and is a troublesome menace to further class legislation.

The people's Representatives are to be silenced. The committee and the caucus are to do the work. We are already witnessing the development of this new scheme. The Committee on Ways and Means at the beginning of the session obtained leave to sit during the sittings of the House. This I am told is customary. This is the most important committee of the House and is charged with the onerous and responsible duty of considering all matters relating to revenue and the bonded debt of the United States. At this session it has been engaged in framing a new tariff bill, and this has brought before it the representatives of all the interests likely to be affected by this legislation. The room provided for the meeting of this committee is I believe the most spacious and commodious committee-room under the control of the House. Notwithstanding this they have, from lack of room to "do the business of the country," been compelled to shut up the front entrance to this wing of the Capitol and turn the wide and ample hallway into an additional room for their use, while we pass in and out through the basement story.

Here to these committee-rooms come pilgrims from every State in the Union, some seeking aid for new schemes, some asking additional help for old, and not a few protesting against both. Here are displayed samples of wares and merchandise which ask bounties and protection while the oily-tongued representative of monopoly and advocate of public plunder arrays figures and statistics to prove that unless taxes are levied for his protection his business must fail. I listened, Mr. Chairman, to many of these special pleas, and if we believed all they said we would be bound to conclude that our protected industries were the most unfortunate, helpless, and impoverished of all our enterprises. The Committee on Elections has likewise had leave to sit during the sitting of the House, and the same is perhaps true of other committees, so that the House has found itself frequently without a quorum, and the dignity and power of the people's branch of the American Congress is reduced to that of a side-show, in which the members as the mere puppets of arbi-

trary power are useful only in maintaining the forms of law and are allowed occasionally to perform for the amusement of the galleries. And all this has been deemed necessary in order "to do business."

Mr. Chairman, where is this matter to end? We have not committee-rooms enough now. We are making provision for the removal of the library in order that that portion of the Capitol may be subdivided into committee-rooms in which to "do business." Indeed, if the decree of the committee and the caucus is to prevail what need have we of this magnificent Hall, the theater of so many intellectual combats and the field for patriotic thought and action in the past? A much smaller room will do for the Clerk. Let the committee and the caucus report to him, and so the law shall be written. Then this space may be subdivided into stalls where the protectionist can display his wares and drive his bargain with the Government for subsidies and taxes. If we are to "do business," if the Republican theory is correct that it is the duty of the Government to exercise a paternal care over the business interests of the country, taxing here and bestowing there; if we are to take charge of the vast and varied interests and industries of a mighty people, we certainly should make room for the representatives of every interest so that they may have an equal hearing and that the importunities and clamor of the strong may not drown the more plaintive and pitiful cry of the weak.

Mr. Chairman, if this plan is to proceed, if it is to be carried to its legitimate and logical sequence, then this Capitol, this magnificent and stately building, with its marble walls and massive pillars, with its lofty and liberty-mounted dome, this citadel and symbol of the majesty of an intelligent and free people, with all its sacred associations and hallowed memories, shall become a mere market-house in which to "do business."

In view of all this, I fully realize that nothing that will be said in this debate by members on either side will in the least affect the result. We know that the caucus has decreed that this bill shall pass and we feel that we are only performing a kind of public duty and discharging an individual responsibility when we arise in our places and utter our protests against the passage of the bill.

We have here before us now, embodied in the bill and exemplified in the report of the majority of the committee, accompanying the bill, as well as in the opening speech of the chairman before the House, an open, clear, and unequivocal setting forth of the protective theory. For the first time in our history a political party has committed itself squarely to the doctrine of taxation for the sake of protection. Up to this time the most zealous protectionist had only contended that that clause in the Constitution which gave power to Congress "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" might, under the "general welfare" clause, be exercised in such a manner as that, while affording a revenue to the Government, the tax should also operate as a protection to manufacturers. Now we are clearly told that this power is to be exercised, not for the purpose of obtaining revenue, but for the purpose of preventing the collection of revenue.

In their report the committee say:

The exact effect upon the revenues of the Government of the proposed bill is difficult of ascertainment. That there will be a substantial reduction, as we shall show, admits of no doubt. It is not believed that the increase of duties upon wools and woolen goods and upon glassware will have the effect of increasing the revenues. That would, of course, follow if the importations of the last fiscal year were hereafter to be maintained, which, however, is altogether improbable. The result will be that importations will be decreased, and therefore the amount of revenue collected from these sources will be diminished.

In every case of increased duty except that imposed upon tin-plate (which does not go into effect until July 1, 1891) and upon linen fabrics the effect will be to reduce rather than to enlarge the revenues, because importations will fall off.

The bill, then, as is clearly admitted, is framed with a view to reduce the revenue by raising the tax. This declaration should be taken in connection with the one made a little further on in this report, where they say:

We have not been so much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been to encourage a system of home production which shall give fair remuneration to domestic producers and fair wages to American workmen, and by increased production and home competition insure fair prices to consumers.

Taking the two together the bill is shown to be a bill to prevent the collection of revenue by decreasing importations and raising the price to consumers. In other words, the tax which was heretofore paid to the Government is to be added to the price of the manufactured goods, and the consumer, instead of paying the tax to the Government, is to pay it to the protected manufacturer. "We have not been so much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume," say the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this makes the matter plain. Heretofore the Republican press, and in campaign times the Republican orators, have stoutly denied that protection raised prices to consumers. By a certain kind of statistical and arithmetical jugglery they even claimed that protection made lower prices. But that kind of an argument would not do to support a bill which put sugar on the free-list and a tax on agricultural products. For awhile it was thought possible to deceive the farmers with the claim that protection reduces prices, but their recent discontented movements have been witnessed and their murmurs and complaints have been heard. They, too, have discovered that you "have not been concerned about the prices of the articles we consume," and now the mask is thrown boldly back and the farmer is told that protection does raise prices and that the

blessings of high prices so long enjoyed by the manufacturer are going to be extended to him.

And so I say we are fortunate at least that the issue is squarely put. But while I can not speak for the farmers of other sections, I can say to you gentlemen that so far as Indiana is concerned this sop which you have thrown to the farmer is lost. It will not deceive nor enslave him, for he has long since learned that no tariff laws which you can devise will raise the price of a single product of his labor so long as we have a surplus of that product for exportation.

In the opening of this debate we were again told that all of our prosperity and development in the past was due to this protective system. No good which has befallen us as a people has been allowed to escape. Every blessing which industry, patience, climate, soil, ingenuity, or a kind Providence has wrought out for us has been harnessed up to the car of protection and made to serve its votaries. We are told that it has enriched the farmer with a home market; that it has built railroads and paid the Government debt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the protected industry does not support or develop the farm. It is the farmer who supports the protected industry. The farmer is the pioneer. He goes to the front and blazes out the way; he fights the battle with the forces of wild nature, and then he clears the way for settlement. When the settlement is made, then the shop comes, and by and by the shops grow as the result of the development and prosperity of the farmer. The shop does not produce the farmer, but the farmer produces the shop. The same thing is true as to the railroads. They are built for the purpose of conveying to market the products of the farm; until those products are harvested there is no necessity or demand for a railroad. It is to get to the seaboard and to the marts of the world that railroads are built.

Protection never built a railroad; protection is against railroads. Horace Greeley said, many years ago, that, "whenever a steam-engine carries away the products of the farm to a foreign country its whistle is the scream of an evil genius and its smoke the black flag of an enemy." He was the greatest of American protectionists, and who will claim, in the face of such a declaration, that protection builds railroads? Why, Mr. Chairman, protection does not build anything. The very argument made here in this Hall in its support is that it is a baby. It creates nothing, it eats, it wants to be helped, it wants to be carried, it wants to climb on somebody's back. [Applause.] We have carried this infant for a hundred years, and it now comes in and claims that all of our gathered strength and accumulated resources are the result of our labors and sacrifices in its behalf.

We are also told that it has paid the national debt. We hear this frequently. It is not always stated exactly the same way. We are sometimes told that the Republican party has paid the debt, and then again we are told that protection has paid the debt. The statement is varied to suit the occasion. Like the other claims made for this cause, this statement in whichever form you put it is misleading if not entirely false. The national debt has been reduced, it is true, and reduced by the collection of revenues under a high tax system, but this is not conclusive evidence that the debt has been paid. If the gentleman will look at the statistics of indebtedness of our country he will find that that debt has only been shifted. It has passed from the Government to the individual, and that in this process a debt which was once an obligation against all the property and a claim upon the industry of a whole nation is now transferred to the homes and is a burden upon the backs of those who toil.

I know it has been denied here by some that the people are much in debt and the depressed condition of the agricultural classes has been made light of, and I am going to call attention to that fact, for whenever a square issue can be made upon a mooted question it is a pleasure to see that issue presented. My friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] a few days since took occasion to denounce very severely my friend from Illinois [Mr. LANE] who sits in front of me, because he saw fit to call attention to the fact that the farms in his district were heavily mortgaged and that the farmers were not prosperous. I call attention to the language of the gentleman from Ohio, which I read from the RECORD:

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, there may be sections in this country where beggary and pauperism are predominant. There may be certain sections in the country from which capital ought to stay away and from which immigration ought to fly. The gentleman from Illinois may represent here a district of penury and squalor. It is hardly a fair thing for the people of his district to be thus held up to public scorn and contempt [laughter]; but if political capital can be made by depreciating the situation and the character of the homes and the farmers and the people, I suppose, in the great exigencies of politics, it must be done. [Laughter.] I hope the gentleman from Illinois will put into the public press a map of his district with a warning to the capital of the country, "This is a section which industry and capital must avoid."

Mr. LANE. I will put in the whole State of Kansas.
Mr. GROSVENOR. I will be just as courteous to the gentleman as he was to me; I will not be interrupted by him. [Laughter.] I do not represent that sort of a district, Mr. Chairman. I represent an agricultural community, a community of which to-day I have received for the first time the statistics of the mortgages. There has been a great deal said here about mortgages, and there seems to be a purpose on the part of certain Representatives to warn the country against the districts they represent. The red flag of pauperism is flung out by certain Representatives here to warn the people of the country that there is penury, and pauperism, and beggary where these gentlemen come from. I have no such district; yet I represent an agricultural district, a district dependent very largely upon agricultural productions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to cast no reflections upon the district from which the gentleman comes and of which I have no doubt he is justly proud. But my purpose in calling attention to these remarks and to the district of which they speak is simply this: I presume that no higher compliment could be paid to any district in the United States than this loyal Representative has paid to his own. I suppose it to be a model district, and for this reason I have taken it for an example. I have examined the records, and I find mortgages even in this prosperous locality. I have the figures, and will give them as I took them to-day from the Ohio statistics for the years 1888 and 1889.

In the five counties composing this district of Athens, Meigs, Monroe, Morgan, and Washington, there were executed during the year ending June 30, 1889, 1,663 new mortgages, securing an indebtedness of \$1,129,965.97, and during the same period there were released 1,241 mortgages, securing \$902,487.33, leaving of that year's transactions 442 unpaid mortgages, securing \$227,478.64. I did not pursue the inquiry further to see how long this had been going on at that rate, but if the people of these counties have been making mortgages at the rate of over \$200,000 a year in excess of those paid off it would not take a good mathematician very long to determine that the time will soon come when the gentleman from Ohio will not be so prompt to rebuke another member of this House for calling attention to the real condition of his people.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not stop then in my investigation. I have great admiration for the great State of Ohio, and have no doubt it stands in the front rank of prosperous and wealthy States. From the statistics of that State for 1888, compiled according to law, and by the State authorities, I took the figures showing the amount of indebtedness in the form of recorded mortgages upon the real estate of Ohio. That amount was, in 1888, \$9,625,984.95. The total valuation of the real estate of Ohio was \$30,033,961—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Thirty millions? Why, my district has more than that.

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. I beg pardon. I am reading the figures of your district instead of the State. I thank the gentleman for the correction. The total amount of the unsatisfied mortgages for the State is \$330,999,205.78. The total valuation of the real estate of the State is \$1,220,262,525.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is better.

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. That is better; but what follows is not so good. The per cent. of indebtedness upon the whole valuation of the State of Ohio is 27, while in the gentleman's district it is 32, showing that the mortgages upon the gentleman's district are 5 per cent. heavier than the average of the State, and that nearly one-third of the farms and homes of that district are completely covered with mortgages.

In addition to this I wish to call attention to a statement from a very high Republican authority as to the condition of the farmer. I read from a report of the Committee on Agriculture to this House submitted at this session. This report says:

Your committee believe that no public interest, at this time, presses with such extreme urgency upon the attention of Congress as some measure of relief to the distresses of agriculture. This industry is the foundation of all our prosperity. All other trades rest in it, like spokes in a hub, and are bound to it with a tire of dependence. History gives no example of a country that survived its decay. This interest is now in alarming straits; hunted down, at bay, fighting for life.

Up to this time no complete collection of the statistics of mortgage indebtedness has been made by the General Government. We have made an appropriation, and I understand the agents are now in the field for that purpose. I predict that when these returns come in no man who has any regard for his reputation will ever stand upon this floor and say that during the last twenty-five years the aggregate indebtedness of the people of the United States has been reduced. You have paid the debt, indeed, but where did you get the money? You have compelled the farmer and the mechanic and the struggling, toiling poor to mortgage their farms and their homes to raise the money to furnish to you for that purpose.

There is nothing which I can recall that so well illustrates the absurdity of this pretension as the account of Wilkins Micawber celebrating with a sumptuous dinner the payment of a pressing debt with money borrowed by the aid and at the expense of poor Tommy Traddles. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish briefly to speak of some of the items put on the free-list by this bill.

The first item to which I call attention is "feathers and downs for beds." We have put a high tariff on wool for the protection of the sheep, and I do not see why the geese ought not to have the same protection. The only reason I can imagine for this discrimination is that the sheep generally belong to the men and the geese to the women, and the men have votes while the women have not. [Laughter.] There is just as much reason for taxing feathers and down as there is for wool, and more, because downy beds are a luxury, while woolen clothes are a necessity. The next item is hair, "human hair," "raw, uncleaned," that is the description of it. Now the object I suppose in putting dirty human hair on the free list is to encourage the millinery business, to encourage the wearing of false bangs. [Laughter.]

Another item which these gentlemen who have been engaged in reforming the tariff have given us free is, "statuary and paintings

in oil and water colors." This is an innovation. Heretofore these things have paid high duties. The duty collected on these for last year amounted to \$357,921.47.

Now, by this bill, all this revenue is to be surrendered. For whom and why is this done? It is said that it is done to encourage art and cultivate the taste, but this is not so, for already all such articles are admitted free of duty where it is shown that they are for public galleries, to be placed upon exhibition for the benefit of the public. No, Mr. Chairman, it is to enable the rich, who can always get a hearing here—it is to enable them to decorate their parlors and ornament their homes without the payment of a tax.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. My friend will allow me to say that the Mills bill, so called, which went into "innocuous desuetude" a few years ago, put on the free-list "human hair, raw, uncleaned, and not drawn;" also "paintings in oil and water-colors" and "statuary not otherwise provided for."

Mr. COOPER, of Indiana. Yes, sir; but while it did that it put wool and many of the necessaries of life on the free-list. It did not give free paintings and statuary to the rich and tax the poor man's coat and hat at over 110 per cent., as this bill does. No one ever claimed that that bill was a perfect measure. It was a compromise by which, in order to get some relief for the people, concessions were made. But you have copied all the bad features of that bill and left out every good one.

The next item to which I invite attention is "opium—unmanufactured opium." Mr. Chairman, in 1889 there was imported 472,936 pounds of unmanufactured opium, valued at \$1,068,374. It paid a tax of \$10 a pound, which is the existing rate, making the sum of \$472,936, which went into the Treasury of the United States. Now this item is to be free, and for what? Fortunately we are not left to blind conjecture or speculation as to the purpose of this proposed change. The report of the committee explains it all. I read from that report:

If crude opium be put on the free-list as is proposed, it is presumed that opium will be manufactured in the United States for smoking purposes. Sections 34 to 38, inclusive, contemplate such manufacture and provide for an internal tax thereon with necessary safeguards.

They are going to encourage the manufacture of opium in the United States for smoking purposes! I suppose we shall soon have some millions of dollars invested in factories for this purpose. Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know, or at least have heard, of the injurious effects of the use of opium. It is far more harmful to the system than any of the stimulating drinks to which our people may be addicted and far more fatal in its consequences. I have heard, however, that while under its influence the most delightful fancies play across the brain and that among its other enchanting spells it works its victim into the belief that he is rich. As they are going to vote these taxes upon us, I suppose this is the antidote; that we are to supply ourselves with an opium pipe and smoke until we forget our troubles and are rich in our imagination. [Laughter.]

This bill gives free salt to those engaged in the fisheries along the shores of our navigable waters. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to free salt, but I mention this to show the fallacy and falsehood of the arguments made to sustain the duty on salt. Free salt was given to encourage a class of fishermen who lived and labored along our sea-board States in days gone by. But the American fisherman is a thing of the past. All this fishing is done now in large ships owned by wealthy men of Boston, who, for the most part, employ Canadian laborers, and this bounty of free salt is given to them. Now, when we ask for free salt for our dairymen and for our packing-houses and for our people, you tell us that salt is too cheap now, that it costs literally nothing, and that the tariff does not make it cost any more, but really brings down the price.

I ask you why do you not talk that way to the Boston ship-owners, and why do they want free salt if it does not come cheaper? And I say to you that on the grades we use you put the highest rate of duty, 12 cents per hundred pounds, while the coarser article is charged at a much lower rate. No, Mr. Chairman, the Boston ship-owners are a privileged class, and they are allowed to escape the burdens of government because they are rich and influential. But I tell you that even the women who make butter out in the great Northwest are beginning to understand your system of taxation, and it will be difficult for you to make them believe that you tax their salt to bring down the price, while you give free salt to the Boston ship-owners as a bounty.

Sugar and molasses are put upon the free-list. This reminds me very much of certain entertainments and church fairs, which I have attended, when the admission was free. They were very pleasant occasions, but I always found that while we got in free it generally took \$2 or \$3 to get out. I think we will find it so with free sugar under the proposed bounty system. I believe that the tax on sugar ought to be reduced, and that it ought to be reduced so that sugar could be sold so low that there would be no temptation to adulterate it. It ought to pay a small duty because it is the cheapest possible way for the people to pay their taxes.

The tax on sugar is a revenue measure. It is estimated that we import about nine-tenths of the sugar we consume. On all this the Government gets a tax except that which comes in under reciprocity treaties, amounting on the average to about \$55,000,000 per

annum. The increased price on the other tenth produced at home inures to the benefit of the sugar industry. Now here is a tax nine-tenths of which goes to the Government and one-tenth to a home industry. This bill proposes to abolish this tax, and in its stead place the tax on those articles nine-tenths of which are produced at home and not more than one-tenth imported, thus putting the home industries exactly in the place of the Government, giving to them the nine-tenths of the tax and reserving but one for the Treasury. Not only does this bill take directly from the revenues of the Government \$55,000,000 per annum and give it to the protected manufacturer, but it adds an additional burden upon the people by proposing to take out of the common Treasury and pay as a bounty 2 cents a pound for every pound of sugar produced in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, to my mind this is one of the most unauthorized, unconstitutional, and unjust provisions in the whole list of this new bill of "abominations."

The report of the committee says:

Even on the assumption that, with proper encouragement, we shall eventually be able to produce all, or nearly all, the sugar required for the consumption of our people—an assumption which your committee believes to be sustained by many facts, notwithstanding the slow progress thus far made in sugar culture in this country—this encouragement can be given much more economically and effectively by a bounty of 2 cents per pound, involving the expenditure of but a little more than \$7,000,000 per annum with the present production of sugar in this country, than by the imposition of a duty involving the collection of \$55,975,610 in duties in the last fiscal year, not to mention the amount indirectly involved.

Now if it be true, and it is, that on the amount of sugar already produced in this country the bounty will be \$7,000,000 and if the other proposition is also true that by this system of bounties we will "be able to produce all or nearly all the sugar required for the consumption of our people," then the annual payment will be 2 cents per pound upon 3,076,277,079 pounds, that being the total amount consumed last year, which will be, in round numbers, \$60,000,000! Who can fail to see what a field for temptation and corruption this will open? With the doors of the custom-house thrown open for the admission of foreign sugar how can it be otherwise than that foreign sugar will be mingled with the domestic and the bounty collected? Why, sir, I believe that Cuba will ship her sugar across by night and that all along our Southern seaboard there will be such a stimulation to sugar production as will astonish the world. To carry its provisions into effect the bill will require such an army of new office-holders that they will thrive and swarm over the land like the lice and the locusts of Egypt.

This bill puts a tax of 1½ cents per pound on all lead contained in silver and other ores. Heretofore this article has been upon the free-list. The object of this change is not to raise the revenue, because we do not need it. These ores have been brought in freely from Mexico. "The free admission of fluxing ores from Mexico," says the minority report, "has enabled our citizens to establish and maintain large smelting works at El Paso, Tex.; Argentine, Kans.; Newark, N. J.; Kansas City, Mo., and a great many other places." The object of this bill is to prevent the importation of these ores. This will destroy these industries. Thus, to encourage our lead miners, one industry, we destroy our smelting furnaces, another. Who shall say which is the better? But that is not all. By shutting out the Mexican ores we lose a large share of her trade. Already the Mexicans are preparing the way of retaliation. The Mexican Government has contracted for the erection of five smelting works within her own borders, and we are told that the greater part of the capital to be invested comes from Europe. Who will doubt that the silver extracted from these ores excluded from our country by this bill will be diverted to the countries across the water, where it will purchase supplies which we might have furnished.

In this connection I wish to read a letter from the president of the Farmers' Alliance of Kansas:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., April 25, 1890.

DEAR SIR: The following letter addressed to the editor of the Rock Islander, Rock Island, Ill., dated April 20, by the Hon. B. H. Clover, president of the Farmers' Alliance of Kansas, is respectfully submitted for your consideration:

CAMBRIDGE, KANS., April 20, 1890.

To the editor of the Rock Islander:

DEAR SIR: Your note of the 15th was duly received. Absence from home prevented an earlier reply.

"The putting of a tariff on the Mexican ore would, to my mind, be a serious blow to our interests, both agricultural and other industries. The smelting establishments now in operation would be seriously crippled in their infancy, and the consequent shutting out of our products from the markets of Mexico would be a serious matter to us.

"Railroads must pay their dividends, interest, and taxes, and the cutting off of the transportation of these ores, and of the other business thereby created, would lay a much heavier burden on the farming interest.

"If we are to have free coinage of silver it must not be limited, either directly or indirectly, because that tends to the creation of a bullion trust.

The meeting of the county presidents of the Farmers and Laborers' Alliance of Kansas passed, unanimously, a resolution demanding the admittance of these ores free. Sometimes free trade is the best protection, and this seems to be one of the matters in which that rule will apply. By this the great agricultural and industrial interests are protected from injury and the business of the railroads is also protected. And so is the smelting business protected—which I believe is the protection idea in general.

I feel very sure that the conditions that will be brought about by a taxation of the silver-bearing lead ores of Mexico will be disastrous to the best interests of agriculture in the West, which is the all-overshadowing interest, and also an injury to the manufacturing and laboring interests of the West. We can not slam the door in our neighbor's face and then expect his friendship if we do it.

I look upon this measure of taxation as being more in the interest of the cur-

rency contractionists than any other interest, and as the South and West are almost universally demanding free coinage of silver, contraction of the supply of silver bullion is in the interest of dear money. I do not think there will ever be gold and silver enough to make a basis broad enough for a circulating medium to rest upon sufficient to do the business of the country unless it should be "watered" freely; therefore every interest that demands "more money" should be "forninst" this taxation.

Yours truly,

Hon. G. W. COOPER.

B. H. CLOVER.

I do not believe I can add anything to the strength and clearness of the statement made in that letter. It is perfectly plain that this duty on lead ores will destroy our trade with Mexico, as the duty on copper ores has destroyed our trade with Chili, and that it will wipe out the enterprises I have named. It will increase the price of lead, decrease the supply of silver, and benefit nobody but the owners of a few lead mines.

Mr. Chairman, from data contained in the report of the majority of the committee, I have compiled the following table, showing the rate of taxation both under existing and under the proposed law:

Articles.	Existing law.	Proposed law.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Chemicals, oils, and paints	36.37	37.30
Earths, earthenware, and glassware	51.09	52.89
Metals and manufactures of	38.24	39.52
Wood and manufactures of	18.40	19.17
Sugar, except grades made free	41.88	55.37
Cotton goods	35.64	38.06
Flax, hemp, and jute, and goods of	33.51	42.26
Wool and woolen goods	58.98	79.92
Pulp, paper, and books	19.84	23.57
Average rate	33.95	48.06
Increase		14.11

The list contains, practically, all the articles which may be classified as the necessities of life, and shows an increase of over 14 per cent. in the rate of taxation.

At whose instance is this taxing power set in motion? Upon whose demand is the tax-gatherer called in and given additional power to harass and distress the people with an increased rate of taxation? The Government does not need the money. Its coffers are full; its necessities are supplied. Again I ask, for whose benefit and upon whose demand do you increase taxation? I will tell you at whose demand and for whose benefit it is done; or rather I will let the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] tell, for in his speech he said:

I want to read a letter which I will print in my remarks, with the statement of more than a dozen leading men, representing capital to the amount of thirty, forty, or fifty millions, who say that if this duty is put upon tin-plate they will at once embark in the manufacture.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the men who influence legislation, upon whose suggestion taxes are levied, and for whose benefit we are to bear additional burdens.

Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to further speak of this bill in detail. Of the theory upon which it rests I wish to say that it is a radical departure from all the sound and conservative principles which have been held in common by the wisest statesmen on both sides of this controversy in the past. It is protection run mad. No one has ever dared to go this far before. It destroys all hope of the extension of our commerce. It cancels and gives to the winds our protestations of friendship for and puts an end to our negotiations for better trade relations with the other American countries. It shuts out opportunities for some, disregards and destroys the interests of others, and by taxing all heaps high the glittering pile of the parasite.

If you gentlemen suppose that you are warranted in going to this extreme by the result of the last election, you are deceived. The cause of tariff reform was never so strong as it is to-day. Its leader and brave exponent has never capitulated; its forces have never disbanded; its organized and disciplined troops are in the field, and its banners are in the air. [Applause.] You have but won the preliminary skirmish. The real battle is yet to be fought. The cause of reform is not always immediately successful. Resistance to oppression sometimes fails and justice is often long delayed.

The friends of caste and class and the Hessian hirelings of an arrogant and grasping power once undertook the experiment of fastening upon the American people an unjust system of taxation. It was so then that the better organized forces of the oppressors sometimes drove the friends of liberty and equality from the open field and pursued them in swamp and thicket. Yes, sir, oppression had its hours of exultation and its days of triumph. With bacchanalian revels it celebrated the forging of those chains which were soon to be riveted upon those contumacious and rebellious spirits.

But, sir, how brief their hour of triumph, how vain and futile their unhalloved plans and purposes, and how triumphant at last was freedom's cause, let history tell. At a later period the enemies of our commerce and the oppressors of our merchant marine achieved a temporary triumph and stalked even here among these

halls with fire and sword. But the temporary occupation of the nation's Capital gave no guaranty of an ultimate triumph. Again the nation's cause and the honor of her heroic sons were vindicated by the people's dauntless champion on the shores of the great Gulf at the battle of New Orleans. [Applause.]

No, sir; yours is a temporary triumph. Whichever way your eyes may turn you can not fail to see the elements moving against you. If to the South, you fail to hear the stories of local disturbances with which you have frightened your followers into line in the past. But, instead, you behold a people full of hope, inspired with new zeal and devotion to the cause of our common country, and patiently bearing within their own bosoms their loss and grief as a sacred sorrow.

If you turn to the North, you will see her brave and victorious people no longer fired by the spirit of sectional hatred, but full of charity and fraternal feeling. Meanwhile, up and down our high-ways of trade and travel the implements of our internal commerce, running to and fro like the weaver's shuttle, have woven into one warp and woof the common interest and the common destiny of both North and South.

In the East the restless and enterprising spirit of her people is no longer content to look out upon the ocean and see the sail of every nation but our own. With a knowledge of the rich and inviting fields of commerce that await them, with an aptitude for such an occupation, and with facilities and surroundings which but for our restrictive legislation are the best in the world for its successful prosecution, they are justly indignant toward that party and that policy which shut out their greatest opportunity.

In the West the great farming industry, so long the victim of your system, taxed to the very extreme of forbearance and endurance, "in alarming straits, hunted down, at bay, fighting for life," seems at last to realize that protection is the siren's song that has lured them on to the very brink of ruin. And that head that for a quarter of a century has meekly bowed to bear your yoke is now erect and in its furrowed face there gleams defiance mingled with despair.

These things you say you can not see. These voices you do not hear, or hearing you are deaf to their appeals. You will pass this bill. You will lay on these additional burdens, and once upon the statute-book the law itself will plead our cause and contribute to its final triumph, for—

When once a shaking monarchy declines
Each thing grows bold and to its fall combines.

[Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the committee, I desire to occupy just time enough to refer briefly to the figures which my friend from Indiana [Mr. COOPER], who has just taken his seat, has placed in the RECORD in regard to my district, and which he says he has done because on a former occasion in the course of a debate on this floor, in which I had the honor to participate with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE]—

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. The point of order I make is as to whether or not there is a list of recognitions by the Chair for this evening's session, and, if so, that it should be followed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But when a gentleman is recognized by the Chair, the question of recognition is already decided.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. Well, if the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio, I shall be glad to know it. I presume the gentleman is on the list.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the time will be properly divided, and that gentlemen on his side of the House who desire to be recognized will have an opportunity in the order in which they appear upon the list furnished the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, when interrupted by the point of order, that under the guise of answering an argument I had made in the debate in which I had the honor to participate with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE] some time ago, my friend from Indiana has seen fit to become terribly misled in regard to certain figures which he has put before the committee to-night as representing the financial condition of my Congressional district. I want to say to the gentleman, however, in the first place, that he has made out for me and for my district a much better condition of things than I had possibly imagined could exist. [Laughter.]

He has shown that in the entire five counties composing my district there are recorded but a little over one million of dollars of mortgages in a year, as against an assessed valuation of real estate of more than \$30,000,000, and, further, that \$900,000 of these mortgages were redeemed inside of the year. That, I take it, is a pretty good district to represent, and I am prouder of it now than I ever was before. [Laughter and applause.]

But let me tell the gentleman from Indiana something else that perhaps has not been discovered by him. There is no system of figures that is more misleading in this country than those in which the gen-

tleman has seen fit to indulge to-night. Nobody knows better than the gentleman himself that the record of unredeemed mortgages communicates nothing to the intelligent, well posted, and skillful man. This is manifest for the reason that a mortgage of \$10,000, we will say, is put upon a great farm, and the custom, the habit, in all parts of the country is constantly to pay such mortgages off in installments, and yet no cancellation takes place until it is entirely paid, and very often not even then.

In a long time, in which I have had something to do with these matters, I have learned that a very large proportion of this country has upon it uncanceled mortgages which have long ago been paid off; and it is not uncommon in the experience of every man who makes examination of these records, men who make abstracts of titles, to find unredeemed mortgages running away back all along the line, and yet when he comes to ascertain the facts they have been paid long ago, but not canceled. Any man familiar with real-estate matters in the country knows that to be true.

Now, in that Congressional district, rapidly improving under the protective tariff, during the very period the gentleman speaks of, a town of considerable importance, reaching now nearly 2,000 inhabitants, has been laid out, lots have been sold, and mortgages given for the unpaid portions of the lots in question, the payments being in part cash, and these enter necessarily into the number of mortgages which appear on the record-books of the county of Athens in that State. Of course they go to swell the number considerably.

But let me tell the gentleman that in 1888 we sold in that district in which I live 250,000 pounds of wool, and that the same number of pounds in the next year, following the defeat of the Mills bill, sold for \$50,000 more money to the county than that number of pounds the year before. [Applause.]

That is the sort of district I represent.

[Mr. KINSEY withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, the two great questions which are at present of paramount importance to the people of this country are the financial and revenue policies of the Government, and in my opinion the great depression which has overtaken our agricultural interest is traceable directly to the evil effect resulting from past legislation upon these subjects by the Republican party. The Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report estimates the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, at \$385,000,000, and the necessary ordinary expenses (including pensions at \$104,000,000, and the sinking fund, \$48,000,000) at \$331,000,000, leaving a surplus of only \$44,000,000.

The McKinley bill cuts down revenues \$71,264,414. Fifty-four million eight hundred and ninety-four thousand one hundred and eighty-one dollars of this sum is reached by putting sugar up to and including No. 16 Dutch color upon the free-list and paying to the sugar-producers of this country a bounty of 2 cents per pound each year until July 1, 1905. The official returns of the sugar product in the United States in 1888 was 375,856,877 pounds. A bonus of 2 cents a pound upon this amount—and the yearly production will not come under it—will be \$7,520,000.

The dependent pension bill carries an estimated increase of \$8,000,000. Upon the 1st day of May, the Committee on Rules brought in a special order and forced through the House the Morrill dependent and service bill, which the Senate estimates as carrying \$42,000,000 and the House bill \$39,000,000. Mr. CARLISLE, whose knowledge and experience is entitled to great weight, stated upon this floor he believed that the bill would carry at least \$50,000,000. It is an easy matter to add these several sums, to-wit: increase in dependent pension and pension bill, estimated at \$8,000,000; the Morrill dependent and service bill, \$50,000,000; cut in revenue by the McKinley bill, \$71,264,414; bounty to sugar producers, \$7,500,000, aggregating \$136,500,000, from which deduct the surplus of \$44,000,000, and there will remain a deficiency of \$92,500,000, without considering proposed legislation for rivers and harbors; direct-tax bill (which has passed the Senate and is on the House Calendar) \$17,000,000; fortifications, public buildings, proposed Federal election law, and the various other schemes now in the Senate and House, their advocates themselves out in the vague as to the millions these measures carry to be wrung from the earnings of the already overtaxed and overburdened farmers and laborers.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to a question there?

Mr. PIERCE. Make it short, as I have but little time.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Do you not know that we have to appropriate \$14,000,000 this session to pay for public building, provided for by your last Congress?

Mr. PIERCE. Let that be as it may. By the way you are making up the list I think you will have seventy-five.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Not half as much as the appropriation made necessary by acts of former Congresses.

Mr. PIERCE. Then you beat us about \$20,000,000.

By increased taxation as proposed in the McKinley bill, levied almost exclusively upon the necessities of life of the great mass of our people, while the billions of the monopolistic few, the manufacturers, the railroads, national banks, national bonds, the Goulds, Carnegies,

Vanderbilts, etc., are to go on the even tenor of their way, given additional privileges, as is now being done to further rob the farmers, while they are troubled only by the gathering in of their ill-gotten gains.

Mr. Chairman, most truly do we stand face to face "with a condition, not a theory"—that condition a depleted Treasury and an impoverished people. How are these conditions to be met? What will the Government do to fill this gap in its revenues? To do as is proposed in the McKinley bill will increase the duties upon the necessities of life of the people. Mr. MCKINLEY tells us:

Your committee conclude, therefore, that the proposed bill if enacted into law will certainly reduce the revenue from imports at least \$60,936,536, and probably more, and from the internal revenue \$10,327,878, or in the aggregate \$71,264,414.

Upon the 1st day of July, 1862, Congress passed an income tax, which did not go into effect until 1863, by which all incomes in excess of \$600 and under \$10,000 were taxed at the rate of 3 per cent. and over \$10,000 5 per cent. From this tax in 1863 the Government collected the sum of \$2,741,857 and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1864, \$20,294,733. On the 3d day of March, 1865, the act of July 1, 1862, was amended so as to increase the 3 per cent. tax to 5 per cent., and the tax of 5 per cent. on incomes over \$10,000 was changed to 10 per cent. upon the excess over \$5,000 and under these two acts the Government collected \$32,050,017.

The armies of the Confederacy under General Lee had surrendered in April of 1865; the strife between the North and the South had ended. Peace was in the land. The enormous fortunes amassed during the war were made evident upon the 30th day of June, 1866, when the fiscal report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue showed that there had been collected for that year upon incomes \$72,982,395; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1867, \$68,014,429. Upon the 2d day of March, 1867, the income tax was again amended, and the exemption increased from \$600 to \$1,000.

By the same amendatory act all discrimination in taxing incomes in excess of \$1,000 was abolished, and the tax fixed at 5 per cent. on all incomes in excess of \$1,000, and by the provisions of this act all taxes on incomes were to expire with the year 1870. Under the changes made by this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1868, there was collected \$41,455,599, and at the end of the fiscal year 1870, \$34,791,857. Upon July 14, 1870, the tax was by Congress extended for one year, and at the same time the exemption was increased to \$2,000 and the rate reduced to 2½ per cent.

Upon the 26th day of January, 1871, the Senate passed a bill repealing the income tax, which bill was not passed by the House until the 3d day of March, 1871, the last day of the Forty-first Congress, passing the House without taking the yeas and nays. Though the act was repealed as above stated, yet taxes due for the year 1871 and preceding years due and not paid were continued to be collected until 1877. There was collected for the year 1871 \$19,162,652; for the year 1872, \$14,436,861; for the year 1873, \$5,062,312; and from 1874 to 1877, inclusive, \$140,391. Under the income tax there was collected a total of \$346,906,738.

But, sirs, from the national banks, the owners of national securities, and the monopolistic wealth of the country the edict had gone forth that the income tax, by which they were made to bear a part of the expenses of the Government, should be repealed. Their behests were obeyed, as shown by its entire repeal in 1871. Who are better prepared to bear their part of the expenses of the Government than those who have been the recipients of its special privileges, its bounties and protection? Why should they not bear their part of the burden of taxation in common with the poorest in the land?

Up to the present time they have been paid by the Government in interest alone \$2,407,000,000 in gold.

Mr. Wells, Special Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in his report for the year 1869, shows that for the year ending June 30, 1868, the income tax yielded to the Government the sum of \$41,455,599, and that this sum was collected from only two hundred and fifty men out of a population of forty millions of people. The aggregate income of these two hundred and fifty persons being in excess of \$800,000,000, making a liberal allowance for the number in each of the families of these persons, together they did not number more than a million of persons, leaving nearly forty millions of people who were directly interested in the retention of the income tax.

It is a significant fact that the only ones who demanded its repeal were the parties who paid it. Public sentiment demanded its retention, as is evidenced from the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue recommended to Congress that the tax should be retained. They but indorsed the recommendation of Commissioner Wells in his report for the year 1869.

Mr. Chairman, upon the 26th day of January, 1871, the bill repealing the income tax passed the Senate by the close vote of 25 to 24, and, strange as it may seem, the names of Senators SHERMAN, of Ohio, and MORRELL, of Vermont, are recorded in the negative. This bill went to the House, and on the 9th day of February a motion to take up and consider the Senate bill was defeated, the vote being 104 yeas, 105 nays. It will be observed that the vote in the Senate and in the House are an exact equipoise, but the power of the money kings could not be

resisted, and the Representatives of the people in the last hours of the Forty-first Congress trampled under foot the wishes and the interests of the great mass of their constituents, and struck down the only fair, just, and equitable system of taxation this country has ever had.

The repeal of the income tax, the manner in which it was done, should and will prove a valuable lesson to the farmers and laborers of the country. They must fully comprehend the lesson taught them by 250 men, what organization can do, make them fuller aware of the battle before them, to make these favored classes bear their part of the expenses of the Government. Let the farmers learn that "in unity there is strength," and support no man who is not pledged to stand by and support measures in their interest, for whatever adds to their welfare increases the prosperity of the whole people.

The lot of the farmer is most unfortunate. Confronted on one hand by low prices for all he raises and has to sell, on the other by high prices for every article he has to purchase, his condition is certainly not an enviable one. From every part of the land comes the cry of distress and depression among the agricultural interests. Faced with this condition of things the query naturally arises, what causes these conditions? The earth in obedience to the labor of the farmer has yielded bounteously of her hidden wealth; yet the farmer sits a beggar in the midst of his plenty, a pauper by the side of his own garnered golden sheaves.

What are the real causes? Is it overproduction? Is it the competition of foreign agricultural products, filling our markets and depressing the price of our own? Or is it the tariff, which adds to the cost of every article used by the farmer, makes him sell in the cheapest and buy in the dearest market of the world?

In 1861 the Morrill tariff was enacted, its author saying at that time: This is intended as a war measure—a temporary measure—and we must as such give it our support.

And again he said:

The present bill is not likely to suit everybody, and I regard it as only a temporary measure, fit to be introduced because of the imperious necessities of our present condition.

These are the utterances of a man who was the leader of his party, speaking by authority; and again, upon the 9th day of May, 1870, Mr. MORRELL said in the Senate:

At the same time it is a mistake of the friends of a sound tariff to insist upon extreme rates imposed during the war if less will raise necessary revenue.

We find this principle abandoned in the national Republican platform of 1888, when it said the tariff laws should be—

So revised as to check imports of such articles as are produced by our own people.

And this promise the McKinley bill proposes to carry out. Mr. MCKINLEY tells us in his report to the House—

We seek by increased duties recommended not only to maintain but to enlarge our own manufacturing plants and check those supplies from abroad which can be profitably produced at home.

Thus do we see the Republican party plant itself unequivocally upon the side of the manufacturers and trusts, out of whom they "fried the fat" during the last Presidential campaign for the purpose of debauching the ballot-box.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I quote from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRELL]:

In making an estimate of the effect of such a war tariff as is now proposed, it is important that we should bear in mind that as we increase the cost of any article we diminish the number of those who are able to consume it.

But the Republicans of to-day do not propose to heed this truth uttered by one of their party, who is now a Senator in the other end of this Capitol, for Mr. MCKINLEY and his Republican brethren on the Ways and Means Committee say in their report:

We have not been so much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been for encouraging the system of home production.

While the leaders of the Republican party have thus shown their disregard of the interests of the farmers and consumers of the country, they will find out in the fall elections that the consumers are concerned in the price of the articles they buy.

In 1847, Robert J. Walker, who was the Secretary of the Treasury under Mr. Polk, in a published letter to the people of the United States, said:

Our present system of taxation is the most onerous ever imposed upon any people and is utterly destructive of the prosperity of our country.

Such, Mr. Chairman, was the deliberate judgment of one of the greatest Secretaries of the Treasury this Government has ever had, and the majority report confesses the evils of protection when it admits that after nearly thirty years of protection under the Morrill tariff and its numerous increases the agricultural interests "are suffering from low prices."

Gentlemen upon that side tell us that under the rule of protection

millions have been added to the wealth of the country; but the effect of this bounty system which has robbed one to give to another has been to make millions of tax-ridden farmers and a few thousand millionaires, and these last represent the wealth and prosperity of the country.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] has told us that we Democrats pursue the shadow of protection, while they (the Republicans) enjoy the substance. The gentleman never uttered words more pregnant with truth. The great mass of the Democratic voters are farmers and laborers, men who earn their living after God's mandate "in the sweat of their face." Under high tariffs our crops have been good, wealth has increased at an unexampled rate. This is just what we expected. His farm is as productive as ever, but not to him. He produces the greater part of the wealth of the country, and the manufacturers—the protected industries—get the lion's share of it.

This the farmers are realizing is just what the tariff is for. The farmers labor and toil to produce the wealth of the nation, and it is taken from them by the tariff. The manufacturer enjoys, as Mr. MCKINLEY has told us, the substance, while there remains with the farmer only the shadow. The shadow of protection now sits gaunt and hollow-eyed in the mortgaged homes of hundreds of thousands of farmers, and holds high carnival over the burning corn of Kansas and the depressed and ruined agricultural interests.

The farmers are slow to move in political matters, but want, bankruptcy, mortgages and trusts are powerful forces. Mr. MCKINLEY and his colleagues upon that side, after they have passed this bill and increased the stream of protection upon the country, will in a few months realize how an outraged people's patience has ceased to be a virtue, and he and the Republican party will be in the condition of a certain animal *Æsop* tells us of, who stole his neighbor's meat and in crossing a stream caught at the shadow and lost the substance.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. PIERCE. I have not a great deal of time.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Can you mention a single article that is not cheaper now in this country than it was manufactured than it was before protection was begun?

Mr. PIERCE. Does the gentleman mean to say that protection does it?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. PIERCE. Does he not know that the cause of the reduction of prices in this country has been by reason of improved machinery? And to more fully answer the gentleman I quote from a speech of Hon. W. M. SPRINGER:

A striking illustration of the increased productive power of human effort is found in the manufacture of boots and shoes. By comparing the census report of 1870 with that of 1880 it will be seen in reference to this important industry that in the year 1870 91,702 hands were employed in factories in the manufacture of boots and shoes. They produced in this year 80,627,244 pairs. This amounted to a product of 879 pairs to each hand employed. In 1880 there were 111,052 hands engaged in this industry, and the number of pairs of boots and shoes made aggregated for the census year 125,478,511. This shows an annual product for each hand of 1,129 pairs. The increased productive power of those engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes in factories was 250 pairs to each hand, or over 28 per cent. But let us follow these facts further. The total amount of wages paid in 1870 for the manufacture of the 80,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes that year amounted to \$42,504,444. This shows that each hand received 52 cents per pair for making boots and shoes in factories during that year.

In 1880 the 111,052 hands employed received altogether in wages for their labor but \$43,001,438, or only 35 cents per pair. By comparing these figures with 1870 we will perceive that the loss to the operative on each pair produced amounts to 17 cents, or a decrease of nearly 33 per cent. In other words, one hand in 1870 for making two pairs received about the same pay he received in 1880 for making three pairs.

A further fact is worthy of note in this connection. The average annual pay of each hand engaged in this branch of industry in 1870 was \$463.50, and for 1880 the average pay was only \$387.21.

Thus we see that the average compensation of each operative employed in our boot and shoe factories for the year 1870 was \$76 per annum more than that paid in 1880, and the number of pairs made by each was 250 in number less in the former year than in the latter. In other words, operatives were paid in the year 1870 \$463.50 for the manufacture of 879 pairs of boots and shoes, while in 1880 they were paid at the rate of only \$387.21 for the manufacture of 1,129 pairs; so that while the productive power of labor increased 33 per cent. in ten years the compensation of the workingman in this branch of industry decreased 16 per cent.

During the past twenty years the protection on boots and shoes has been 35 per cent. ad valorem. Whatever advantages this protection may have been to the manufacturer, it is quite certain that the workingmen in that industry received no benefit. Protection failed in this case to protect or benefit laborers in boot and shoe factories.

Take another illustration. In 1870 the production of cotton goods or cotton fabrics amounted to 349,314,592 pounds, and the hands employed were 135,369. The product per hand was 2,580 pounds. In 1880 the production was 607,264,241 pounds. The hands employed were 172,544. The product per hand was 3,519 pounds.

The increase per hand was 939 pounds, or 36 per cent. The wages paid in 1870 amounted to \$39,044,132. This was an average for each hand of \$288. In 1880 the wages paid amounted to \$42,040,510, or an average of only \$242 to each hand. The wages of each hand decreased \$45, or 18 per cent. in ten years, while the productive power of each increased 36 per cent. During this period the protection on the principal articles of production and consumption of cotton fabrics was over 50 per cent. In this industry the manufacturers may have been benefited, but certainly the laborers received no benefit. Protective tariffs do not protect the operatives in cotton fabrics. I might go through with the whole list of highly protected industries and the result would prove the same: an increase of productive power and a decrease of wages. Protection does not protect labor.

A report of Mr. Blaine, while Secretary of State in 1881, said that he had to admit as an astounding fact that in England, in the cotton industries, laborers are paid the same as they are in the United States, with only a few cents difference in the per diem wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And for the benefit of the gentleman I will print in my remarks the language of Mr. Blaine:

The average wages of employes in the Massachusetts mills are as follows, according to the official returns: Men, \$3.30; women, \$3.62; male children, \$3.11; female children, \$3.08. According to Consul Shaw's report, the average wages of the men employed in the Lancashire mills the 1st of January, 1880, were about \$3 per week, subject to a reduction of about 10 per cent.; women, from \$3.40 to \$4.30, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.

The hours of labor in the Lancashire mills are fifty-six, in the Massachusetts mills sixty per week. The hours of labor in the mills in the other New England States, where the wages are generally less than in Massachusetts, are usually sixty-six to sixty-nine per week. Undoubtedly the inequalities in the efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as it seems to be proved from official statistics, it would be an important element in the establishment of our ability to compete with England for our share of the cotton-goods trade of the world. In the two prime factors which may be said to form the basis of the cotton manufacturing industry—namely, raw material and labor—we hold the advantage over England in the first and stand upon an equality with her in the second.

This refers to only one industry, it is true, but it is a protected industry, and it is one in which a few days ago the principal mills at Fall River, Mass., "dividing only a small portion of their earnings," declared dividends of 24 per cent. What shall be said of the impudence of the assumption that high wages in this country depend upon the tariff when "protected labor" in the United States has become but another name for pauper labor?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Have not our inventions, under protection, been superior to any other?

Mr. PIERCE. Does the gentleman claim that under protection the sun shines brighter?

Mr. ENLOE. He means to say that there is a protective tariff on the inventive genius of this country.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I say it has developed inventive genius.

Mr. SHIVELY. Of course; it was the statutes that originated these inventions.

Mr. PIERCE. Just one question I want to ask about, and that is the hide question [laughter]—these hides that the Republican committee seem to be in such trouble about in their bill, putting them in and putting them out four different times. They could not sleep soundly at night, for in their ears rang the bellow of the big-horned cattle of the North and Northwest, asking for protection on their "infant industry" [laughter and applause], while by day they were besieged by a clamorous crowd from along New England's rocky shore who wanted their hides free. So between the two—

They wired in and they wired out, and left us all in doubt
As to whether hides were going in or coming out.

[Laughter and applause.]

The committee has put upon the free-list sugar up to and including 16 Dutch color. Do gentlemen understand and know what character of sugar that is? Do you know that for the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1889, there was imported into this country, not above No. 13, 2,275,159,339 pounds of sugar? Do you know that there is scarcely any of these grades of sugar used by the people? I will venture the assertion that there is nowhere in your district, Mr. Chairman, half a dozen men who buy these grades. The sugars up to and including No. 13 are low grades—in fact No. 16 is but little better—and are not used.

It is the granulated sugars that are used; and the putting of these sugars on the free-list, and putting four-tenths of a cent on all grades above No. 16, is directly in the interests of the sugar trust; the four-tenths of 1 per cent. covers the cost of refining. The trust gets, under this bill, its sugar for refining free, and the people are not benefited; for, as I have stated, they do not use the grades admitted free. Mr. Chairman, of sugars above No. 13 and above No. 20 there was imported for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, only 22,293 pounds, valued at \$1,152. Who is benefited is fully evidenced by the following article taken from the Pittsburgh Dispatch, a leading Republican paper:

It is probably true that the sugar trust succeeded in getting the 5 per cent. ad valorem margin of protection allotted to it by the first draught of the bill changed to a specific duty of four-tenths of a cent. This is positively true, and not merely a matter of probability. Moreover, the 5 per cent. differential duty (equivalent to one-sixth of a cent per pound) was not only to be found in the "first draught" of the bill, but was also retained, ostensibly as the final conclusion of the committee, until the night before the bill was reported to the House. The change was made at an interesting midnight conference in Mr. MCKINLEY's private rooms. Since that time the market value of sugar-trust certificates on the stock exchange has advanced about \$11 a share and the purchases have been very large. In other words, the market value of the trust as a whole has been increased about \$5,500,000.

And this is a contemplated fraud and swindle upon the consumers and the Treasury of the Government by the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, while the Republican farmers out in Kansas the past winter were burning their corn and grappling with the shadowy skeleton of protection, here in Washington one of the chief beneficiaries of this system was giving a "royal feast," and upon that night two dis-

patches, one from Washington, the other from Pittsburgh, were sent out by the Associated Press. I give them both:

THE FEAST.
WASHINGTON, February 25.—The dinner given to-night by Mr. Andrew Carnegie to the President and Cabinet and the delegates and officers of the International American Conference was one of the most elegant affairs of the kind ever given in Washington.

The arrangements, which were novel and unique, were planned by him, but as he has been compelled to be absent from the city, he left the details to be carried out by a friend, Mr. William E. Curtis. The walls of the large new dining room at the Arlington Hotel were literally banked with spring flowers. The table was circular in form, 36 feet in diameter, and covers were laid for forty-eight gentlemen. The center of the table was a mammoth four-leaved clover of maiden-hair fern, over which was suspended a huge silver lamp, the brilliancy of which was softened by festoons of sea-weed that dropped into the maiden-hair. The angles between the leaves of the clover were filled with solid masses of orchids, tulips, and crocuses, there being thousands of blossoms, which were collected in New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, Jacksonville, Pensacola, and other cities of the South, as well as in the green-houses of Philadelphia, New York, Newport, and Boston.

The bill of fare consisted of oysters on the shell, clear turtle soup, broiled sole from England, with cold cauliflower; broiled breasts of spring chickens from Louisiana, with hot asparagus; roasted spring lamb from Scotland; teal ducks from Currituck Sound, North Carolina, and the usual desserts. The wines were Château Yquem, "Twelve Apostles" sherry, Château Lafitte, Royal Berton Sec, and some rare Madeira.

The menu was engraved in fine script upon heavy beveled blocks of *papier mâché*, and no French terms were used.

Every particle of food was described in plain English. In the upper left-hand corner of the block were the initials of Mr. Carnegie in two shades of green, while the name of the guest was, by a new and peculiar process, blown in glass at the bottom.

During the dinner a vocal and instrumental concert was given instead of the orchestral music. Mme. Marie Decca, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, Mr. Herndon Morsell, and the Schubert Quartet gave the vocal numbers. Miss Alice Rymond played a cornet solo, Mr. Ernst Lent a solo on the violoncello, Messrs. Elkstein and Andrews a duet for zithers, and Mr. Xander presided at the piano. There were no formal speeches.

Let us not forget that this Mr. Carnegie has a tariff income of over a million dollars a year and has in the past few years reduced the wages of his workmen more than once. Rails are selling in the United States at the same price they are in England, and Mr. Carnegie said he could lay down his rails in San Francisco at a freight charge of \$5 per ton and at New Orleans for \$2.50; and I can not understand how British rails can be made to pay \$17.56, or \$10 per ton, with ocean freights added, and compete with American rails. I can see no necessity for a reduction in wages should the tariff all be taken off.

Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable interest that I look over this bill of fare and note the good things that Mr. Carnegie searched the earth to obtain to please the palates of his guests. Just look at some of them:

- Broiled breasts of spring chickens from Louisiana.
- Chicken legs and wings could not be tolerated.
- Teal ducks from Currituck, lambs from Scotland, and "broiled sole" from England; wines, "Twelve Apostles."

Mr. Chairman, what is "broiled sole?" Is it something that flies in the air, swims in the sea, or walks on land? "Broiled sole!" I thought it might be in some way connected with hides, as they seem to have settled down on the free-list so our Republican friends could all get one; and if you gentlemen further increase the duties upon the necessities of life of the people they will furnish each one of you next fall with a "sole" lasting in its effect; and when in the next world you look for the "Twelve Apostles" you will, I fear, be furnished with a "broiled soul." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the Ways and Means Committee say on page 17 of their report:

We advance the rates upon the products of the soil which either do supply

THE THREAT.
PITTSBURGH, February 25.—The statement in the Washington dispatches that it was likely that the Ways and Means Committee would advise a reduction of the duty on steel rails from \$17.50 to \$10 a ton has excited no little comment among the steel manufacturers in the Pittsburgh district. Of all those who are indirectly interested but two firms make steel rails: Carnegie Bros. & Co., at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, and the Allegheny Bessemer Steel Company, at Duquesne. The Edgar Thomson, which is one of the largest plants of its kind in the world, is just now filled with orders, and is turning out steel rails as fast as the rolls will do the work.

"A tariff of \$10 a ton on steel rails would in nowise be sufficient to protect the industry," said a member of the firm of Carnegie Brothers & Co., this evening, "and the whole tariff might as well be removed as to reduce it to that point. At present English steel-rail manufacturers can successfully compete with American manufacturers on the Pacific coast, in Southern markets, and at other seaboard points where they have the advantage of cheap ocean freights. The present tariff, which slightly exceeds \$17.50, is even insufficient to protect us at these distant points. It costs us \$5 to send the rails to San Francisco, and about half that sum to transport them to New Orleans. English manufacturers send their products around Cape Horn at less cost. The home market in the vicinity of Pittsburgh and at nearer points is controlled entirely by local competition. Steel rails are selling here now at \$35 per ton. Should we sell rails at the cost of production plus the tariff they would be at least \$50 per ton."

"With us it is a matter of the cost of labor. Should the tariff be reduced it would bring about a reduction in the wages of the workmen, from the men who take the rude ore from the mines to those who put the finishing touches to the rail. But we do not desire to see such a reduction. As a rule, American rail mills turn out better work than their foreign competitors. Our better-paid men do finer work than underpaid men would or could. If the tariff be reduced at all, it should not be fixed at a cent less than \$15 a ton. As it is, we have practically no control over distant markets, and as far as they are concerned a reduction of the tariff would make but a slight change. If the entire home market is to be saved to the American manufacturers the tariff must be increased. Let the duty be put down to \$15, and it is possible that we might be able to get along."

or can be brought to supply the home consumption. Horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, bacon, barley, beans, peas, beef, mutton, pork, buckwheat, butter, cheese, eggs, hay, hops, milk, poultry, flax-seed, vegetables, potatoes, flax, hemp, hides, wool, tobacco, and many other products are advanced with a view to save this entire market to the American farmer.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.	Value of importation.	Revenue.	Proposed revenue.
Bacon and hams.....	2 c. per lb.....	5 c. per lb.....	\$45,890	\$5,442	\$13,606
Beef, mutton, and pork.....	1 c. per lb.....	2 c. per lb.....	12,337	2,155	4,311
Straw.....	Free.....	\$2 per ton.....	28,921	8,676
Tenassels.....	Free.....	30 per cent.....	2,309	632
Vegetables, not otherwise provided for.....	10 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	437,377	43,737	109,344
Potatoes.....	15 c. bush.....	25 c. bush.....	321,120	132,507	220,846
Hogs.....	20 per cent.....	\$1.50 each.....	4,770	954	2,179
Corn.....	10 c. bush.....	25 c. bush.....	1,212	238	358
Corn meal.....	10 c. bush.....	20 c. bush.....	352	89	78
Oats.....	10 c. bush.....	15 c. bush.....	10,178	2,232	3,348
Wheat.....	20 c. bush.....	25 c. bush.....	3,977	389	496
Wheat flour.....	20 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	5,804	1,160	1,451
Milk.....	10 per cent.....	5 c. per gal.....	5,684	568

I do not believe the farmers of America are to be caught by any such chaff as this. If you were to put \$1 tax on every bushel of grain imported and the same per pound upon meats and all other agricultural products, it would not benefit him one cent; and the farmer has realized the fact that he raises a large surplus of all these things, and that the market in which this surplus is sold controls the price right at his own door, and that no protective tariff that ever did or ever will exist will do him any good. He knows that Liverpool—a free-trade city—fixes the price, and he gets free-trade prices for all he sells here or abroad. What the American farmer wants is a market in which he can buy his necessities of life as cheap as his competitors buy theirs; and if he can not secure this he should have the privilege of selling his products and be permitted to bring his purchases home without being taxed beyond the necessities of the Government simply to put money in the pockets of a few favored classes.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, we exported 69,592,929 bushels of corn and imported 2,388 bushels; we exported 312,186 bushels of corn meal and imported 396 bushels; we exported 46,414,129 bushels of wheat and imported 1,946 bushels; we exported 624,226 bushels of oats and imported 22,324; we exported of rye 287,252 bushels and imported 16 bushels; of flour we exported 9,374,803 barrels; exports of apples 942,406 bushels, imports none; exported dried apples 22,101,579 pounds, imports none; we exported of bacon and hams 400,224,646 pounds, imports 272,130 pounds; we exported of lard 318,242,990 pounds, imported 1,073 pounds; we exported of tallow 77,844,555 pounds, imported 34,931 pounds.

When the farmer looks at these figures is he such a goose as to believe a tariff of any amount on these articles will make his own products bring him more money? But you Republicans say that it will; and so as to put the manufacturers, trusts, combines, etc., on a par with the farmer you will increase the rates of duty upon every article he uses or buys, and raise the duties of the following necessities of every farm and consumer in the land:

On cotton-ties and barrel-hoops from 35 per cent. to 114; common window-glass raised to 123 and 138 per cent.; camels' hair, which is made into underclothes, drawers, and shirts, taken off the free-list and taxed 77 per cent.; coarse woolen shawls, used by the wives and daughters of the poor, tax increased to 135 per cent.; worsted goods, used by the families of our farmers, duty increased to 130, while the most costly, used by the wives and daughters of the rich, taxed only 90 per cent.; women's and children's cheapest cotton-warp dress-goods, tax raised to 125 per cent.; finest, taxed only 86 per cent.; cheapest underwear, tax increased to 112 and 138 per cent.; finest grade, 78 per cent.; coarsest wool hats, duty increased to 111 per cent.; finest grade only taxed 66 per cent.; coarse blankets, duty increased to 106 per cent.; finest pay only 72 per cent.

These are but a part of the articles which this bill makes dearer to every consumer. What do the people think of this condition of things which has reduced all farm values lower and lower, while all manufactured articles are being raised higher in price by increased tariff duties?

The Pioneer Press, of St. Paul, Minn., the leading Republican paper in the Northwest, says:

What to-day are the duties on grain, hen eggs, etc., which sapient statesmen are figuring out? Agriculture has been sacrificed to every other interest, until farms are abandoned in New England and the Middle States and distress has overtaken the Northwest and Southwest.

I also quote from a recent letter of J. M. Thompson, master of the Patrons of Husbandry of the State of Illinois:

Farmers in these organizations and out of them have been studying the tariff question, and seven out of ten have become dissatisfied and do not regard the new schedule with much favor. The Ways and Means Committee seem to believe they can pacify the farmer by putting a tariff on wheat, corn, oats, barley, beans, and cabbage. Now, any farmer of ordinary sense or intelligence

should know this is a humbug, and will not raise the price of his products 1 cent, nor would \$5 per bushel on corn help him a particle. If they are honest in trying to help us, why don't they vote us a bonus on these products as they do on sugars?

Mr. Thompson butspeaks the truth. The farmers have just as much right to have a bounty given them on their wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton as the producers of sugar and silk.

Since 1861 Republican high tariffs have been in force. What are their effects upon the material interests of the country? How has agriculture fared under its operation? That side of the House tells us all the blessings of the Government have come from the Republican party and a protective tariff. Then if evils come under this system it must bear the responsibility. Take the great manufacturing States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, where protection has had full sway.

Horace Greeley said years ago that when the time came that the farmers of the great manufacturing States had a manufacturing town in nearly every one of their counties, the farmer would have a home market at his door; that he would get good prices for his products and buy manufactured articles cheap. How has this prophecy turned out? Let us begin with the three manufacturing States, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. I quote from the official annual report of the State assessors of New York. It reads as follows:

There continues to be marked depreciation in the value of farm lands in nearly every county, and the depression among the farmers continues, while the prospect for improvement is not good. Many assert that after paying expenses they can not realize from their farms sufficient to pay the interest on mortgages, and consequently thousands of farms are falling into the hands of mortgagees.

The following table is taken from the census reports of 1850, 1860, 1870, and 1880, showing the value of farms, farm animals, farm implements and machinery:

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
New York.....	\$650,202,067	\$936,366,584	\$1,494,738,190	\$1,216,637,765
New Jersey.....	135,342,305	202,131,598	286,856,830	212,678,330
Pennsylvania.....	464,068,693	751,166,275	1,194,786,853	1,095,406,324

These figures include the entire farm values, increase in values, implements, improvements, and stock of the farmers of these States. The country, I remind that side of the House, from 1850 to 1860 was in the control of the Democratic party, and that the rate of duty upon dutiable goods imported during these years did not reach 27 per cent., and for the year 1857 the rate was 22.45 per cent.; 1858, 22.44 per cent.; 1859, 19.56 per cent., and in 1860, 19.67 per cent. From 1850 to 1860 farm values, etc., in New York increased \$286,164,517, and during the same year farm values, etc., increased in New Jersey \$66,789,000, and in Pennsylvania, \$310,067,582; a good showing for a Democratic tariff. We all know that since 1862 a high protective tariff has been in force, and from 1870 to 1880 the average duties upon dutiable goods imported into this country was from 47 to 47½ per cent.

By again looking to the above table we will find that farm values, improvements, implements, and stock in New York from 1870 to 1880 decreased \$278,400,425. During the same time farm values, etc., in New Jersey decreased \$72,176,500; and during this period in Pennsylvania they decreased \$99,383,529, a loss to the farmers in ten years in these three States of over four hundred and fifty millions. The farmers of these States should not be surprised, for the iron hand of protection in the name of home market and the sacred name of labor has been laid upon their property and earnings, and it has been given to a few thousand millionaires. Now let us see what the decline in the price of farm products has been since 1880.

In report No. 70 of the Department of Agriculture for the months of January and February, 1890, I find that horses have increased within the past year over 500,000 head. Their value is \$3,500,000 less than on June 30, 1889. In cattle, since the 1st day of January, 1889, there has been an increase in number 2,470,855; their value is less by \$49,685,918 than one year ago. In 1884 the value of cattle was \$1,106,715,703; and to-day with 10,000,000 more cattle than we had then their present value is only \$913,777,270, a decrease during six years in value of \$192,938,433. Swine have increased in number the past year 1,250,000 and during the same time have decreased in value \$47,888,857.

Is it surprising that Mr. Carnegie in this robbery gets his million dollars a year income. How long are the people going to submit to these infamies?

In 1850 the farmers of the United States owned \$3,967,343,580 of property. In 1860 their property had increased to \$7,980,493,663, a net increase of 101 per cent. Do not forget that this was under a Democratic tariff. From 1860 to 1870 their property had increased to \$11,124,958,747, but little over 39 per cent. In 1880 they had increased to \$12,104,001,707, an increase of only 9 per cent., and from

1870 to 1880 the tariff averaged over 47 per cent. Mark the difference in the prosperity of the country under a Democratic and a Republican tariff.

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
Farms.....	\$3,271,575,426	\$6,645,045,007	\$9,262,803,861	\$10,197,066,776
Farm animals.....	544,180,516	1,089,329,915	1,525,276,457	1,500,384,707
Farm implements	151,587,638	246,118,141	336,878,429	406,520,055
Total.....	3,967,343,580	7,980,493,063	11,124,958,747	12,104,001,538

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] in his speech to-day told us when the Republican party came into power in 1861 they found under Democratic rule a depleted Treasury, and would have us believe that the agricultural and manufacturing interests were in a depressed and ruined condition.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard this same old argument for years by every Republican orator in this House and out of it. I let one answer these hackneyed charges, who, though he rests in an untimely grave, carried with him the confidence and respect of the whole people. Mr. Garfield, on this floor, on the 6th day of March, 1878, said:

In 1860 the burdens of national taxation were light. All our revenue, including loans, amounted only to \$76,000,000. Our expenditures were \$77,000,000, and our whole public debt but \$65,000,000. In the year 1860 the tonnage of our ships upon the seas was 5,353,868 tons, which was more by 140,000 tons than in any other year of our history before or since. Two-thirds of our imports were then carried in American bottoms, as were also more than two-thirds of our exports.

Our exports that year reached the aggregate value of \$400,000,000, which was forty-three and a half millions more than during any previous year. Our imports were \$362,000,000, decidedly more than any other year. And I make this statement on the authority of David A. Wells, that in 1860 we were exporting to foreign countries more American manufactures than in any other year of our history. In a table printed on page 10 of the report of the special commissioner of the revenue for 1869, it appears that in 1860 there came to this country 179,000 emigrants, 58,000 more than during the preceding year.

As an exhibit of the activity and industry of our people, forty-eight hundred and nineteen patents were issued at the Patent Office in 1860, eleven hundred more than the average number for the three years preceding. In that year we built 1,846 miles of railroad, a slight increase above the preceding year. The people of the United States consumed 332,000 tons of sugar in 1857, and in 1860 they consumed the enormous amount of 464,000 tons, more than in any other year of our previous history. The mean annual consumption of tea in the United States, which was 16,000,000 pounds in the decade ending with 1850, was 27,000,000 pounds in the decade ending with 1860. This certainly is an indication that the people had something to buy with.

From 1831 to 1851 the cotton crop of the United States ranged from one million to two and one-third million bales per annum. In the year 1860 it had risen to the enormous crop of 4,675,770 bales, almost a million more bales than were ever grown in the United States in any previous year of our history.

I find from the census reports that in 1850 our wheat crop was 100,000,000 bushels, and in 1860 it was 173,000,000 bushels. In 1850 we raised 592,000,000 bushels of corn; in 1860, 838,000,000 bushels, while in 1870 we raised but 760,000,000. The crop of 1860 was 78,000,000 bushels more than that of 1870 and 346,000,000 more than that of 1850. And so with several other of the great cereals. The crop of barley for 1860 was three times that of 1850. The crops of rye and buckwheat in 1860 exceeded those of 1870 as well as those of 1850.

In 1850 the value of the American farms was three and one-quarter billions of dollars; in 1860 it was \$6,645,000,000 by the census, an increase of 103 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. during that decade.

The value of farming implements in 1850 was \$151,000,000; in 1860 it was \$246,000,000, an increase of 70 per cent.; while during the next decade it increased but 42 per cent. From the statistics of manufactures given in the census I find that in 1850 857,000 hands were employed; in 1860, 1,311,000. In 1850 the capital invested in manufactures amounted to \$533,000,000; in 1860, \$1,009,000,000, an increase of 90 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. The product of our manufactures increased in that decade \$870,000,000. But the gentleman tells us it was a year of unusual distress.

He spoke of the condition of the iron interest in that year. Let me tell him what the iron and steel associations say in their reports for 1877. I find on page 28 that in 1860 there were brought from Lake Superior to our mills in the East 116,000 tons of ore, 51,000 tons more than in any other year of our history.

On page 47 of the same report I learn that the production of anthracite coal in Pennsylvania in 1860 amounted to 9,807,000 tons, almost 800,000 tons more than in any previous year.

On page 12 of the same report I find that the production of bituminous coal and coke for 1860 amounted to 122,000 tons, which was 38,000 tons more than the greatest product of any preceding year. And how much pig-iron did we produce in that year? I quote from page 302 of the volume of Speeches and Addresses by William D. Kelley—a speech made by him here January 11, 1870, in which he gives the product for seven or eight years; and, according to his speech, in 1860 the total product of pig-iron in this country was 913,000 tons. This was 130,000 tons more than the average of the six preceding years, yet he holds that 1860 was a year of unusual distress.

We can find ample ground for the sufficient protection of American manufacturers without distorting the history of our country. The gentleman's position lays him open to this dangerous reply, that if the low tariff and insufficient volume of currency of 1860 caused the alleged distress of that year, how will he account for what he admits the great distress of 1877, with a much higher tariff and three times the currency of 1860?

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. The aggregate volume of real and personal property in the United States in 1850 was in round millions \$7,135,000,000; in 1860 it was \$16,159,000,000, an increase of 126 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. Yet to suit a theory of finance we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business, equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity in the United States.

Mr. Garfield, from his grave, admonishes you gentlemen on that side

to stick a little closer to the truth and not distort the history of our country. In continuing he said:

I hold that the facts I have cited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity in the United States.

It is time you gentlemen heeded this advice. We see, as Mr. Garfield stated, that not only agricultural products, but that manufactures increased to an extent not equaled by any period from then till now.

On page 14 of the report of Mr. MCKINLEY I find the following:

The contention that wool-growing in this country has not been aided or encouraged by protective duties is sufficiently answered by the following statement of the annual production and production per capita from 1840 to 1884:

Amount of wool produced in the United States.

Year.	Production.	Per capita.	Year.	Production.	Per capita.
	Pounds.	Pounds.		Pounds.	Pounds.
1840.....	35,802,114	2.5	1879.....	232,500,000	4.3
1850.....	52,516,969	2.7	1880.....	240,000,000	4.6
1860.....	60,264,913	1.7	1882.....	290,000,000	5.1
1869.....	162,000,000	4.2	1884.....	308,000,000	5.4
1874.....	181,000,000	4.2			

The gentleman means to tell us that protective duties on wool have stimulated the growth of sheep and increased the price of wool. The tariff of 1867 divided wool into three classes. Two classes were taxed 10 and 11 cents a pound, according to value, and the third class 3 and 6 cents. In 1883 the special duties in the first two classes were changed to 10 and 12 cents and in the third to 2½ and 5 cents. In order to show the condition of the sheep industry from 1850 to 1880, I give the following table taken from the different census reports:

Condition of the sheep industry from 1850 to 1880.

	1880.	1870.	1860.	1850.
United States.....	5,192,074	28,477,951	22,471,275	21,723,220
Ohio.....	4,902,456	4,928,635	3,546,767	3,942,929
Michigan.....	2,189,389	1,985,906	1,271,743	746,435
Pennsylvania.....	1,776,598	1,794,301	1,631,540	1,822,357
New York.....	1,715,180	2,181,578	2,617,855	3,453,241
Indiana.....	1,100,511	1,612,680	991,175	1,122,493
Illinois.....	1,037,073	1,568,286	769,135	894,043
Wisconsin.....	1,336,807	1,069,282	322,954	124,896
Iowa.....	455,359	855,493	259,041	149,960
Kentucky.....	1,000,269	936,765	938,990	1,102,091
Missouri.....	1,411,298	1,352,001	937,445	762,511
	16,924,970	18,284,927	13,286,645	14,120,956
California.....	4,152,349	2,768,187	1,088,002	17,574
Colorado.....	746,443	120,928		
Montana.....	184,277	2,024		
Nebraska.....	199,453	22,725	2,355	
Nevada.....	133,695	11,018	376	
New Mexico.....	2,088,831	619,438	830,116	377,271
Oregon.....	1,083,162	318,123	86,052	15,382
Texas.....	2,411,633	714,351	753,363	100,530
Wyoming.....	140,225	6,409		
	11,140,068	4,583,203	2,760,264	510,757

The wool tariff, in which these Ohio and Pennsylvania wool-growers take such delight, is that of 1867, so that for more than half the decade between 1860 and 1870 these States managed to get along without it; yet the number of sheep increased in the latter State 160,000 and in the former nearly 1,400,000 during that period, while the increase in the first group of States was nearly 5,000,000, five-sixths of the increase in the whole country, which was a little over 6,000,000. In the decade between 1870 and 1880, during all of which time the tariff of 1867 was in force, the number of sheep in this group of States fell off over 1,350,000, in Pennsylvania over 17,000, and in Ohio over 26,000, though the increase throughout the country was over 6,700,000.

A glance at the second group shows where this increase came from, these States and Territories containing nearly 6,500,000 more sheep in 1880 than in 1870. With all the help, therefore, that the tariff of 1867 could possibly have been to Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the first group of States generally, the number of sheep actually decreased from 1870 to 1880 under its beneficent and fostering influences.

In spite of such a tariff natural laws still had their sway, and the raising of sheep and the growing of wool declined in the older States, where land is dear, and enormously increased in the newer States and Territories, where land is cheap.

It is a significant fact that Mr. MCKINLEY let the prices of wool alone. The following article, taken from an editorial in that bitter Republican paper, the Chicago Tribune, fully shows us what is best for the wool-grower:

PRICES OF WOOL UNDER VARIOUS TARIFFS.

[Chicago Tribune.]

The attention of Senator SHERMAN, Columbus Delano, and other advocates

of the high tariff on raw wool is directed to this table of average prices of that commodity in Boston during the last sixty years:

	Cents.		Cents.
1824.....	70	1856.....	60
1825.....	60	1857.....	60
1826.....	52	1858.....	55
1827.....	44	1859.....	60
1828.....	48	1860.....	60
1829.....	55	1861.....	47
1830.....	70	1862.....	57
1831.....	75	1863.....	70
1832.....	65	1864.....	73
1833.....	65	1865.....	95
1834.....	70	1866.....	60
1835.....	65	1867.....	61
1836.....	70	1868.....	43
1837.....	70	1869.....	40
1838.....	55	1870.....	37
1839.....	60	1871.....	46
1840.....	50	1872.....	50
1841.....	52	1873.....	41
1842.....	48	1874.....	40
1843.....	36	1875.....	39
1844.....	50	1876.....	35
1845.....	45	1877.....	33
1846.....	40	1878.....	31
1847.....	47	1879.....	30
1848.....	45	1880.....	30
1849.....	42	1881.....	29
1850.....	47	1882.....	25
1851.....	50	1883.....	25
1852.....	50	1884.....	26
1853.....	60	1885.....	27
1854.....	57	1886.....	32
1855.....	52	1887.....	32

This shows the price of wool under all the tariff systems we have had in this country and explodes the fallacy of "protection." The highest and best prices ever obtained for wool were previous to the tariff of 1867. With that tariff came a decline which ran down to 25 cents in 1882 and 1883, when a portion of the tariff was removed, since when prices have improved.

This knocks into smithereens the argument of SHERMAN and Delano that the reduction of the tariff on wool in 1883 prostrated the sheep-raising industry. That argument is dishonest, untrue, and destitute of a shred of support in any one of the facts or figures in the case.

Mr. Chairman, I am forcibly reminded of an old adage—and I do not mean anything personal—"When thieves fall out honest men get their dues."

The farmers of America have the remedy in their own hands. They can but know how under Democratic rule, under Democratic principles, they prospered, were happy and contented, and that from 1850 to 1860 was in truth the "golden era" in their history. On the other hand, from 1860 to 1890, under Republican principles, they have seen their farm values and farm products blight and wither as if touched by Ithuriel's spear.

The farmers must have representatives on this floor who are alive to their interests; and I say to them, speaking as the Representative of an agricultural people whose every interest is inseparably interwoven with their own, "Here your remedy lies." Congress made the laws that have caused the depressed conditions which are ruining them today. Congress alone can remove them. Let them send Representatives to Congress who will be true to that grand principle of Democracy which says:

Equal and exact justice to all, exclusive privileges to none.

THE TARIFFS AND THE TRUSTS.

[From Justice, Philadelphia.]

1. The steel-rail trust, buttressed by a tariff tax of \$17 per ton.
2. The nail trust, by a tariff tax of \$1.25 per 100 pounds.
3. The iron-nut and washer trust, by a tax of \$2 per 100 pounds.
4. The barbed-fence wire trust, by a tax of 60 cents per 100 pounds.
5. The copper trust, by a tax of \$2.50 per 100 pounds.
6. The lead trust, by a tax of \$1.50 per 100 pounds.
7. The slate pencil trust, by a tax of 30 per cent.
8. The nickel trust, by a tax of \$15 per 100 pounds.
9. The zinc trust, by a tax of \$2.50 per 100 pounds.
10. The sugar trust, by a tax of \$2 per 100 pounds.
11. The oilcloth trust, by a tax of 40 per cent.
12. The jute-bag trust, by a tax of 40 per cent.
13. The cordage trust, by a tax of 30 per cent.
14. The paper-envelope trust, by a tax of 25 per cent.
15. The gutta-percha trust, by a tax of 35 per cent.
16. The castor-oil trust, by a tax of 80 cents per gallon.
17. The linseed-oil trust, by a tax of 25 cents per gallon.
18. The cotton-seed-oil trust, by a tax of 25 cents per gallon.
19. The borax trust, by a tax of \$5 per 100 pounds.
20. The ultramarine trust, by a tax of \$5 per 100 pounds.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, up to within the last few days it had not been my intention to take any part in this debate. I had intended to discuss in some measure the question of trusts and their relations to the present system of tariff taxation when the anti-trust bill should be presented for consideration, but that bill when presented was driven through the House with such indecent haste that I could only take a shot at it on the wing:

I was graciously accorded three minutes' time in which to express my views on the subject. Unlike the French statesman who wanted to have explained to him, so he could understand it, the English system of finance in one hour, I felt that I could not do the subject justice in three minutes, with the Speaker's gavel suspended in mid air to chop off my remarks to the second.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I believe you thought it was necessary to change the Constitution in order to get at it.

Mr. ENLOE. Yes, sir. I will come to that presently if the gentleman will be patient.

I did submit a few hasty observations upon that bill as it rushed by me like a lightning-express train that had been delayed. I will incorporate those few observations, as they were withheld for revision. I did not care to extend them, but I will put them in *nunc pro tunc* (a kind of proceeding which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] will understand), on the principle that the subject of trusts and the interests of trusts will be vastly more affected by this bill than they will be by the anti-trust bill which we passed the other day.

On that occasion I said:

I think, Mr. Speaker, it has been clearly demonstrated in this discussion that nobody has any confidence that this bill will accomplish anything in the way of substantial relief for the people whom it professes to relieve. It comes to us from the Senate. In the first place, it is a mark of suspicion upon it that it passed the Senate almost unanimously. That is evidence enough to the mind of any man who has watched the progress of legislation in this country to stamp it as a measure that is not intended to accomplish anything for the relief of the people.

I have no doubt that it goes as far as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] says—as far as Congress has the power under the Constitution to go—except in one particular; that is, it does not abolish the duties on articles imported into this country which are the subjects of trusts. I would be glad if such a provision were incorporated in the bill. Without that I believe it will accomplish little or no good and afford no substantial relief to the people who are so justly making complaint of the burdens under which they labor.

I want to say to gentlemen here who are undertaking to satisfy public sentiment on this question on both sides of this Chamber that they may belabor the "trusts" with stuffed clubs, but there is a new schoolmaster abroad in the land who is educating public sentiment on these questions. The name of that schoolmaster is necessity; his assistants are want, debt, hunger, cold, idleness; and the lessons that he is teaching are of such a character that if you do not afford some substantial relief the day is not far distant when others will come here and take your places who will undertake to shape legislation so as to afford the relief which the country demands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I favor a constitutional amendment as the only effectual remedy for the suppression of trusts. Still I will vote for this bill, which, if it accomplishes no other good, will at least put Congress on record as declaring that trusts are evils which should be destroyed.

As the gentleman from Iowa has suggested, I submitted an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to empower Congress to legislate concurrently with the States for the suppression of trusts and to prohibit gambling contracts in agricultural products. Earlier in the session I submitted some observations on that amendment, and it would not be relevant here to discuss the latter feature of the amendment, but I will address myself to that feature which seems to be pertinent to this occasion.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached a new era in the history of our development as a people. Our new code of rules under which we profess to proceed, the written code which takes the place of general "parliamentary law" and substitutes the alleged will of the Committee on Rules for the will of the Speaker, is the legitimate outgrowth of the new order of things. Things have been done, and are being done, and are to be done in Congress which will not stand the light of investigation and discussion, and the representatives of the minority on this floor find themselves time after time forced to act on the most important questions without the right of amendment or debate.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the new methods and the new doctrines in regard to legislative procedure are the outgrowth of false and vicious teachings and policies systematically inculcated for a great many years. The natural law of development, quickened by the inventive genius of the American people and stimulated by class legislation, has wrought this new order of things.

There was a time in our not remote history when each State chartered its own banks and had its own local currency; when commerce waited on star-route mails for intelligence and ox teams for transportation; when the individual, the firm, and the feeble corporations were competitors in manufacturing and mercantile pursuits; when the State stood out as a clearly defined sovereignty clothed with ample powers to protect its citizens against combinations to regulate prices and to control the supply of necessary articles of merchandise. But we have passed that point years ago. The States created corporations which issued stocks and bonds and built railroads, and when they placed the iron horse on the track he "scorned the puny hand of the State."

The genius of steam has annihilated distance and riveted the States together with rails of steel. State railway systems have developed into interstate and transcontinental systems, destroying competition. The arms of the State, stretched out to control the children it had created without souls, fell powerless at the State line, and Congress was called on to exercise a power vested in it by the Constitution when the modern agencies of transportation—railroads, steam, and electricity—were "as baseless as the fabric of a vision."

The Constitution was amended by the sword. State banks of issue went down with slavery. Congress has made Wall street the financial heart of the Republic and vested it with full and complete power over the health of every other member of the body politic. This financial evolution wrought by legislation has minimized the man and maximized the dollar.

In business the individual has been virtually swallowed up by the partnership and the partnership has been dwarfed by the corporation and the corporation has been swallowed up by the trust. This is regarded by capital as the perfection of commercial evolution. The apologists and advocates of the trust say that it is an advantage to the smaller capitalist to be absorbed by the trust because the trust can do business for the public cheaper than he can, and can pay him more in salary than he could make in doing business on his own account.

It might be supposed from this argument that the trust is an eleemosynary institution organized for the sole purpose of protecting small capitalists against their own indiscretions and the public against high prices that might result from competition among individuals or rival firms.

If the practice of the trusts had been to use the humane methods of persuasion and legitimate competition only to bring about absorption this argument would appear more plausible, but the meager information about them which we have been able to extract with the corkscrew of investigation shows that they imitate the anaconda and crush their victims before they swallow them. It is the argument of the big fish to the army of little ones that they should willingly be swallowed to make one big fish, because it would redound to the honor and the power and the glory of the fish family.

It is the argument of the monarchist to freemen that they should give up the ballot and surrender their right to a voice in the government of the country and be ruled over by a king because a republic is too expensive, its machinery too complicated, and the power and splendor of a monarchy is so much more glorious than the simplicity of a republic.

The trusts say to the people, "Trust not to the rivalry of a multitude of competitors for fair prices, but place your confidence in the generosity of the trusts, which are guided by the wisdom of self-interest and will not impose greater burdens on labor than it can reasonably bear. Labor is our source of wealth, and the enlightened policy of selfishness will prevent us from robbing it of its productive power."

"Labor is the goose that lays our golden eggs, and while we will pluck it of its surplus feathers we will spare the goose to lay more eggs and to grow more feathers. We do not destroy competition, but only elevate the plane of competition. For the competition of individuals with small capital we substitute the competition of great syndicates and trusts controlling many millions of dollars."

Mr. Chairman, there is a certain degree of plausibility in the argument, but the history of the trusts belies the argument. While great combinations of capital, by specializing the different branches of manufacturing industry, are undoubtedly able to produce complete products cheaper than they could be produced in any other manner, it is a notorious fact that the increased profits resulting from such combinations go to swell the immense fortunes created by the operation of class legislation, and not to the enrichment and elevation of labor.

The labor immediately employed in the creation of this wealth is not enriched, and the labor engaged in other pursuits which consumes is impoverished. Combination is more profitable than competition, and instead of fighting over the profits of business the rule of the trusts is to combine and divide the spoils of labor.

One of the distinctive characteristics of this movement of capital is the power with which every trust is vested for the purposes of unlimited expansion and absorption. Every stage of financial evolution in the direction of trusts is marked by the wreck of the fortunes of individuals and firms and corporations which have attempted to withstand the centralizing power. Having overridden the power of the States and sheltered itself behind the legal forms of trusts, capital has laid its hand on the sources of supply, and through its able advocates proclaims the trust a benefactor to the people because prices of manufactured products have been lowered.

The devil might with equal propriety claim the credit for the spread of christianity or the low price of the Bible. The genius of invention, which has greatly increased the productive power of labor, and the constant increase in the purchasing power of the dollar, the result of the financial policy of the Government, may justly be credited with the decline in prices to the point where the trust by artificial means has become an active agency in promoting higher prices.

The Standard Oil trust, the prototype of the whole blood-sucking brood, is constantly pointed to for proof that the trust has lowered prices and that the advantages of monopoly have all accrued to the people. The price of refined oil was advanced after the organization of the trust in 1882, and an examination of the statistics will show that whenever the price has been below what it was then there has been a corresponding decrease in the price of crude oil. The price is higher now than it was then, and as an answer to the claim that the economies effected and the advantages derived from monopoly inured to the benefit of the public, let us see, Mr. Chairman, what this public benefactor charged the citizen for regulating the cost of his coal-oil lamp.

The capital stock of the Standard Oil trust was \$70,000,000 when it was first organized in 1882. More than one-fifth has been added to the capital stock in stock dividends, and the shares which were at par then

are now worth nearly two for one. It first paid regular cash dividends of 7½ per cent. per annum, but for the last few years it has paid 10 per cent. per annum. According to these figures, the value of every dollar of stock represented in the organization of the trust has been nearly or quite doubled, and if it is not an exception, the original stock represents two or three times the actual investment.

No wonder, Mr. Chairman, it can afford to pay its president \$30,000 a year and each of its eight trustees \$25,000 a year salary. It has multiplied its capital in twenty years almost one hundred fold, largely the result of its pillage from its ruined rivals and from the unprotected consumers of coal oil. I will not go into the history of its remorseless march to the head of the list of monopolies in this country. Its pathway is marked by the wrecks of scores of enterprising and honest competing firms.

Not content with the monopoly of the supply of this great natural product, it laid its greedy hands on the cotton-oil industry of the South, and every farmer in the South is to-day paying tribute to this monopoly in the arbitrary price fixed upon cotton-seed. The sugar trust is the only one of these combinations which can fairly claim to be a public benefactor in any sense. It must rest its claim to beneficence, not in reduced prices to the consumer, but in the fact that it has been an efficient agent in enlightening the average mind through the medium of the pocket.

It commenced with a capital stock of \$50,000,000, says an article in Export and Finance, representing an actual investment of \$16,000,000, and in the first eighteen months it accumulated \$25,000,000 for the stockholders, a sum equal to more than one and one-half times its original capital. This public benefactor still owns its original capital and is still distributing the blessings of "intensified competition" and "minimized profits" to a suffering public at the same old stand and at the same relative cost.

The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means could not do much to show their appreciation of the coal-oil and cotton-seed-oil trusts as public benefactors, but they have framed their tariff bill so as to admit raw sugar free for the benefit of the sugar trust, which is a refiner of sugar, and it provides also for a tax of four-tenths of a cent a pound as a bonus to this monopoly.

I might refer to the jute-bagging trust as another kindred blessing which monopoly has vouchsafed to the cotton-planters of the South as a missionary to educate public sentiment on this question. The barbed-wire and cordage trusts are special missionaries in the West. These are the vanguard of an army of vampires, gorged with the life-blood of labor and thirsting for more.

The farmers and laborers who pay taxes to support the Government are crying out against this robbery and demanding relief, and it is in response to this demand that we passed the anti-trust bill the other day, a measure which commanded everybody's support and nobody's confidence. The charge made by Mr. Cleveland against these combinations in his message to Congress in 1887 has been almost unanimously sustained by both branches of a Republican Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN, who virtually denied their existence at the time on the floor of the Senate, introduced a bill for their suppression, which was bloody in the index and emasculated in the body. Mr. Blaine stands solitary and alone in his party in his bold declaration that trusts are "private affairs," with which the public has no concern, and his late worshippers were falling over each other in their eager haste to fire a blank cartridge at this tardily discovered enemy of the people. The evil is acknowledged and the wrong is recognized by Congress, but the remedy offered will be about as effective, I imagine, as paper pellets from a popgun would be against an armored battle-ship.

The logic of the trust is first centralization and then a choice between despotism and communism. If the trust is right in principle then the Government should own and operate the railroads, the telegraph and telephone lines, conduct the mercantile and manufacturing business, monopolize the banking business, appoint the hours of labor and fix the wages of every person in the land; in short, if the destruction of competition is a blessing and monopoly is the true law of industrial life, it follows that the complete centralization of all power in one agency, to be exercised for the common good of all, is the true end of government.

This is a logical deduction, from which there is no escape.

The trust is the logical sequence of a quarter of a century of unjust legislation all tending to educate and force public sentiment in the direction of the centralization of wealth and the centralization of the powers of Government in Wall street. The public mind has gradually acquiesced in the encroachments of the Federal power until the Constitution has become a rope of sand in the hands of the majority in Congress, which is only in the way when an effort is made to undo some of the evils already fastened upon the people. On the other hand the laboring people are aroused, and in their zeal and excitement it should not be astonishing if demands are made on Congress which if granted would hasten the process of centralization and aggravate the evils complained of instead of curing them.

The people of the Northwest who have found it necessary to use their corn as fuel during the past winter, while the men were idle and starv-

ing in the coal-mining regions, have at last awakened to the fact that they have been blinded by appeals to their war prejudices in order that they might be robbed by legislation. Their representatives here have passed a service-pension bill through this House to add another \$50,000,000 annually to the \$115,000,000 annually required by existing law to pay pensions.

The promise of a seventy-seven-million-dollar bribe in the Blair bill, which was so long held out to the negroes in the South, was buried with the other broken promises of the Republican party as soon as it gained the power to redeem them, and the money which was promised to the colored man is to be given to comfort and reconcile his white Republican corn-burning brother to the perpetuation of the system which robs Peter to pay Paul. How far this system of oppression can be supported by the distribution of the revenues of the Government in bribes to meet party exigencies remains to be seen.

Above the clamor of the mortgage-ridden corn-burners of the West and Northwest and the discontented strikers all over the country can be heard the voice of the false prophet in the Department of Agriculture as he offers up his sacrifices to the idol of protection in behalf of the oppressed agricultural industry of the country, calling on his sleeping deity to send down the consuming fire on his sacrifice as proof to the people that protection is a deity who hears and answers the petitions of his prophets and apostles.

Every argument is used to direct the rising tide of public opinion in any channel but the true one. Any remedy is more acceptable to the friends of monopoly than the true remedy of undoing the wrongs which have been done. Every power of false logic and sophistry is used to educate the public mind into the belief that relief must be sought, not by undoing the wrongs which legislation has fastened upon the people in unjust tax laws and in class legislation, but that those who have suffered must seize the powers of the Government and retaliate by enacting class legislation for their own benefit. Unequal taxation and unequal distribution are among the leading causes which operate to oppress the labor of this country.

Mr. Chairman, these causes can not be removed by appeals to Congress to enact other laws for particular classes which would only intensify the evils complained of and hasten the processes of centralizing the Government.

Let us crush out the trusts and stop the infamous system of gambling in agricultural products even if we have to amend the Constitution to do it. We must have the free coinage of silver. We must destroy the power of a banking monopoly to contract or expand the currency at will.

If the Government needs a paper currency, as it certainly does need it, the legal-tender note is as good as the national-bank note. Both are based on the credit of the Government, and the volume of the currency, which regulates prices in a great degree, should be regulated by the Government, and not by a monopoly which uses its power for its own aggrandizement at the expense of every industry in the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, there can not be a plan devised that will be more than temporary in its effect which does not reduce taxation and restrict expenditures, and I am firmly of the opinion that we are rapidly approaching the time when we will be compelled to resort to an income tax to prevent the utter destruction of the prosperity of the masses of the people. The expenditures are so lavish that the present system of tariff and internal taxation will soon cease to afford sufficient revenues to meet the demand.

Labor is now struggling under a load which it will not much longer bear. More money will give temporary relief, and extravagant expenditures in appropriations in certain sections will afford relief to the favored sections, but so long as labor pays the taxes no just system of distribution will return to any tax-payer as much money as he pays to the Government, and to the farmer who is not a pensioner no part of the money will be returned.

Gentlemen may attempt to deceive farmers with the idea of protection on their products, but no amount of sophistry can conceal the fact that the farmer must sell his surplus products in competition with the whole world. The Democratic party still bears aloft the Jeffersonian banner, proclaiming "equal rights to all men, exclusive privileges to none." The Republican party has proclaimed the doctrine that the Government must take care of the rich and let Providence take care of the poor. This party has seized from the people rights and privileges which are theirs by the divine law of right and granted them to monopolies. It now urges the people to embrace paternalism as the sovereign remedy for all their grievances.

It rushes through, under whip and spur, the anti-trust bill, the shadow of a shade, and says it has exhausted its constitutional power to destroy trusts. It ignores the fact that the trusts built up behind the protective tariff are within the constitutional power of Congress to legislate and to legislate effectively.

It refuses to exercise its power to dethrone the banking monopoly and refuses to tear down the tax barricades which it has erected around this country, behind which lies intrenched an army of trusts which has taken shelter there and is plundering the labor of this country of

hundreds of millions annually. It is upon these lines, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers and laborers, the tax-payers of this country, must direct their advance if they expect or hope to achieve substantial relief. Temporary and doubtful expedients must lead to dissensions and disorders, but on these lines lies the road that leads to victory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a trying duty for me to undertake to entertain this very select audience of members of Congress with my remarks in full. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I move that my friend have permission to expunge his entire speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to expunge my speech. On account of the gentleman's size and appearance I will not compare him to a sponge [laughter], but I think if he will undertake to represent the Republican party, and will read my remarks he will conclude that the people of this country, in dealing with the question of trusts, are likely to expunge him and to expunge his party, unless they change their policy. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I will read the gentleman's speech.

Mr. ENLOE. I am glad to hear that. You will get more information out of my speech than we have got out of any speech you have made here this session. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I think most of the information I get will be out of it rather than in it.

Mr. ENLOE. You will extract the information. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on and elaborate this question of trusts and its relationship to the protective tariff.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that men often feel disposed to reject the truth because it conflicts with their preconceived opinions and antagonizes their political prejudices, but necessity is a convincing teacher. Many men who closed their eyes and would not see and closed their ears and would not hear the truth about the effects of unjust taxation and class legislation when it was the time to prevent it are now staggering under burdens of poverty and debt, lost in the wilderness of political lies, and inquiring the way back to the paths of honest legislation which lead to prosperity and happiness.

The song of the bloody shirt is still sung into their ears by unscrupulous politicians, the hirelings of monopoly who would further rob them, but the tax-payers of this country will wash that bloody shirt in the tears of disappointed politicians and hang it on Mason and Dixon's line to dry.

Sir, it is too late now to stop the investigation going on among the people into the economic questions which involve their prosperity and the well-being of their families by rattling the dry bones of the dead and buried Confederacy. The people know that they are taxed. They know that honest industry does not thrive as it should. They know that from the profits on their industry everybody who touches it is getting richer except the producer, and he is getting poorer.

The railroads are growing richer transporting the products of labor, the mercantile interests are growing richer by exchanging the products of labor, the banks are growing richer by handling the exchanges, the manufacturing interests are growing richer on the products of labor, but everywhere in this broad land, from the field, from the workshop, and from the mine goes up the cry of discontent and distress from the men who toil with their hands.

Trusts and combinations to control the supply and limit the production of necessary articles and to fix the wages of labor, in so far as they have their origin in or owe their existence to our tax laws, should be rooted out and destroyed by a return to a just and equitable system of taxation. There is one class of trusts which can only be reached by additional legislation and another class which can be reached by the modification or repeal of existing laws.

The Standard Oil trust primarily owes its origin to discriminations in its favor by the railroads and secondarily to the use of its almost unlimited capital thus acquired in monopolizing the limited coal-oil supply of the United States and in crushing out all formidable competition.

The second class may be illustrated by any one of the many trusts which are protected from competition by our tax laws. The first class can only be reached by the enactment of State and Federal statutes aimed at their destruction. The second class can be reached by the repeal or the reduction of the taxes now levied for their protection against foreign competition.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] says this would strip the Government of its revenues and compel the imposition of a direct tax. If that proposition be true, which I do not admit, still I would say root out these trusts, impose an income tax, and, if need be, rather than submit to longer pay tribute to the Carnegies and other millionaire representatives of the trusts, let us have direct taxation. That would at least have the merit of being an honest and open tax which would enable the tax-payer to see and to know exactly what tax he pays, and would undoubtedly promote greater honesty and economy in public expenditures.

I have been at some trouble, Mr. Speaker, to get together the most complete list of trusts I could collect with the facilities afforded me, and will submit that list, showing the name of the trust and the tax now imposed for its protection.

That table is as follows:

	Per cent.
Earthenware trust.....	average tax... 56
Glassware trust.....	do..... 62
Plow-steel trust.....	do..... 45
Bessemer-steel trust.....	do..... 45
General steel trust.....	do..... 45
Nail trust.....	do..... 45
General iron trust.....	do..... 45
Copper trust.....	do..... 25
Zinc trust.....	do..... 52
Tin trust.....	do..... 32
Lead trust.....	do..... 74
Glass trust.....	do..... 55
Soap trust.....	do..... 26
Linseed-oil trust.....	do..... 84
Rubber-shoe trust.....	do..... 25
Castor-oil trust.....	do..... 194
Envelope trust.....	do..... 25
Paper-bag trust.....	do..... 35
Barb-wire trust.....	do..... 60
Cordage trust.....	do..... 25
Sugar trust.....	do..... 76
Salt trust.....	do..... 80
Jute-bagging trust.....	do..... 54
Lead-pencil trust.....	do..... 30
Oil-cloth trust.....	do..... 40
Borax trust.....	per 100 pounds... 85
Ultramarine trust.....	do..... 85

The legislation proposed in the bill now under consideration increases the taxes imposed for the protection of these trusts. It will be seen that the taxes now imposed for their protection averages a little more than 51 per cent. In other words, taking the average per cent. of taxes levied for the protection of trusts and using that as an illustration, we find that a trust article which would cost \$1 if foreign competition were permitted, now costs \$1.51.

In other words, the foreign manufacturer who enters this market must pay 51 cents in taxes before he can offer his one-dollar article in this market. What is the effect of this on the consumer? That he must pay the increased price. The foreign manufacturer is practically excluded from our markets. He can not pay the tax and compete. We are told that this tax is levied to protect the home labor against the pauper labor of Europe.

The trust comes to Congress through its representatives and gets these taxes levied to exclude foreign competition, and the extra price is collected from the consumer by the trust, which claims to be acting as trustee for the class of labor engaged in making trust goods. Statisticians estimate that the people pay into this trust fund for the benefit of that class of labor over one thousand millions annually, enough to give every laborer of the class mentioned a brown-stone front and a retinue of servants, with a handsome annual income to support the establishment.

Labor is robbed of the trust fund by these embezzling trustees and the land is filled with strikes, lockouts, and other manifestations of the prevailing distress. Take the case of Mr. Carnegie, the Scottish marauder, who receives a trust fund for the alleged benefit of labor imposed by the laws of Congress amounting to \$4,120 a day. He has his castles in Scotland and gives his magnificent feasts to the rulers of the land, comparable only to the feasts of the Roman emperors, and he dresses "in purple and fine linen and fares sumptuously every day."

Here is a pen picture of the homes of the laborers in whose names he draws by the grace of legislation \$4,120 a day. A correspondent, speaking of these protected laborers' homes, says:

They are filled with pallid humanity, * * * black with age, paintless, carpetless, and uncomfortable. In summer they are dreadful places to live in. The bare hills tower on each side, making a sort of urn in which the hot sun turns the dense air fetid. The sewage runs through open gutters. * * * A walk through the streets tells all.

There are no disguises. The bare, brown door-steps, the tables seen through the open doorway, the frowsy bed standing by the open window, all bear their testimony of a comfortless life in plain view of the passer-by. You may know how much or how little the families have to eat. * * * Courtship and marriage, sickness and sorrow, deaths and births all go on in the purview of men, for poverty can afford no secrets, and the cliff-dwellers of the Monongahela are very poor.

As an evidence that Mr. Carnegie is not the only defaulting and embezzling trustee under this system, I will quote from the Boston Globe an account of an incident which illustrates the condition in which protected labor found itself in Illinois just after the triumph of the party which promises to continue the policy of collecting a thousand millions annually for the protection of trusts:

The Boston Globe says:

A year ago, when Benjamin Harrison was a candidate for President, a delegation of miners from Illinois visited him at Indianapolis. They bore a banner on which was inscribed "Protection and Beefsteak." General Harrison complimented them on their understanding of the situation. If they wanted beefsteak they must have protection, he said—the Republican party's peculiar kind of protection. General Harrison was elected, as the miners hoped he would be. "Protection" was saved. But about the beefsteak.

The newspapers have lately been relating the ghastly sufferings of Illinois miners who have been since May 1 on strike against their protected employers. And the other day the papers told how a horse dropped dead in the mining district, and before the body was cold the raw flesh had been literally stripped from the bones and devoured by the ravenous multitudes of strikers. Perhaps among those poor fellows were some of the same men who paraded the banner before Candidate Harrison a year ago. They made a mistake in the inscription, that was all. Instead of "Protection and Beefsteak" it should have been "Protection and Horseflesh."

The frequent use of Pinkerton detectives to drive out discontented American labor to make room for Hungarians and Italians, imported from the depths of pauperism in Europe, under contract at starvation wages, illustrates the dishonesty of the plea upon which the consumer in this country is robbed to pile up the immense fortunes which to-day threaten the very existence of the Republic.

A writer in *The Forum*, Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, estimates that 250,000 persons own and control between 75 and 80 per cent. of the wealth of 60,000,000 people. He designates seventy persons and estates in the United States who own \$2,700,000,000 worth of property, or an average of \$37,500,000 each. Congress by its legislation is adding to these and other vast estates one thousand millions annually through the protection given to trusts.

For one hundred years the people have voted to take from their own earnings the millions which have built up the great manufacturing industries on the promise held out to them that home competition would reduce prices and repay them for the outlay, and in this debate we hear that promise repeated day after day. But when the manufacturing industries of the United States were built up under this policy until home competition did begin to reduce prices and the manufacturers were forced to reach out for foreign markets to dispose of their surplus in competition with the world, the trust was invented, and manufacturers combined, and production was limited, and the prices of products were advanced, and the laborer in whose name this vast robbery is perpetrated finds no competition in bidding for his labor, but is confronted with fixed prices which he must accept or starve.

This policy has indelibly stamped itself upon this country. It has changed the character of the people in a great degree and taught reliance on the Government instead of self-reliance. It has educated a large class of the people to look to the Government for support in time of distress. It has created two rapidly diverging classes which sooner or later will cause serious trouble in this land, the very rich and the very poor. The hitherto prosperous middle classes are being rapidly swept into the great current of poverty. Unjust taxation and class legislation are doing a fatal work. The East, which has profited by this system, has covered up the West with mortgages and it is reaching out for the South.

The agricultural classes of the South and West are up in arms against trusts, against combines, against monopolies, against the present financial system, against the present system of taxation, and I trust they will not yield one point in the struggle until they restore the industrial health of the Republic. You may pass this bill to fortify the trusts and build higher the walls of protection around them, but the higher they are built the greater will be the destruction when the force of public opinion bursts the barriers, as it will burst them, and sweep every obstacle before it.

You may fry the fat out of the manufacturers, and auction off the Cabinet places, and use the money of the trusts to debauch elections; you may appeal to sectional prejudices and empty the Treasury to pay pensions; you may hatch out in secret election laws to prevent a free and fair expression of the public will, but no device which a reckless and unscrupulous partisanship can invent will prevent the American people from driving from power any political party which champions the cause of trusts and monopolies against the cause of the people.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Chairman, I am for the people against the trusts and monopolies; I am for the man against the dollar; I am for the individual against the machine; I am for the Republic against centralization, anarchism, and despotism. I want to see a Republic great, prosperous, and free. I want to see the poorest and the humblest citizen clothed with civil and political rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by the wealthiest and the most exalted in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, he who would hope in the year 1890 to add anything strikingly novel to a discussion of the principles of protection would be bold indeed. No other subject from the institution of our Government to this day has received as much patient study from scholars and statesmen or been as eloquently and elaborately set forth by gifted orators.

The bill before us is new. It aims, not at applying a patch here and there to the existing law, nor yet its revision with no other object than a mere reduction of duties, but seeks upon a well defined plan to formulate a system which shall guard established hives of industry and develop others which as yet we do not possess.

It would be out of place in this general debate to attempt, even were I capable of it, a review, item by item, of the various provisions of this bill. That will be done by this body in its consideration by paragraphs under the five-minute rule.

My purpose is but to speak briefly of certain of the great underlying principles of this system in their application to this country, to give the reasons for the faith that is in me why a system that has engendered a growth which continually amazes us should not now be relegated to the cemetery of failures in the history of economic government of nations.

In any discussion of the tariff the fundamental object is not or ought not to be the revenue to be raised thereby. From the earliest days of our Government the bringing into play of our own resources, the de-

velopment of our own powers of production, and the maintenance among our own citizens of widely diversified fields for labor have always been far more powerful motives. In the colonial days Great Britain sought to make our dependence complete.

As early as 1710 a resolution appeared in the House of Commons to the effect that the erection of manufactories had a tendency to lessen the dependence of the American colonies upon the mother country. In 1732 the exportation of hats from one province to another was prohibited, and in 1750 "the erection of any mill or other engine for splitting or rolling iron" was likewise interdicted.

In 1774 the Continental Congress assembled, and from its very beginning its proceedings teem with resolutions looking to the building up of our resources and giving employment within our own borders, the aim being, as expressed in the resolution of October 24 of that year, to "promote domestic manufactures."

The political independence achieved by the Revolution was followed by a period in which the inhabitants of this country, forgetful for the time being of that for which they had so valiantly fought, bought in the cheapest markets, where the desired commodities were to be had for the least money, reveled in all the blessings of unrestricted, unchecked traffic, and soon found themselves on the very verge of political disruption and commercial ruin an accomplished fact.

This which is in a measure ancient history to us was a living remembrance in the mind of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in 1816 to Benjamin Austin:

Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.

In his *History of the Formation of the Constitution* Bancroft says:

The necessity for regulating commerce gave the immediate impulse to a more perfect Constitution.

But even in advance of the adoption of the Constitution Pennsylvania had led the way by "an act to protect manufactures," the preamble of which is as true to-day as it was a century and more ago. I quote a paragraph:

Whereas although the fabrics and manufactures of Europe and other foreign parts imported into this country in times of peace may be afforded at cheaper rates than they can be made here, yet good policy and a regard to the well-being of divers useful and industrious citizens who are employed in the making of like goods in this State demand of us that moderate duties be laid on certain fabrics and manufactures imported which do most interfere with and which (if no relief be given) will undermine and destroy the useful manufactures of the like kind in this country.

Such was the spirit under which the Constitution was framed, such the underlying idea when the first American Congress assembled in April, 1789. Hardly had the deliberations begun when petitions began to pour in calling for the enactment of a tariff law which should check foreign importations in the interest of the home producer.

The "mechanics, tradesmen, and others of the town of Baltimore" led the van, followed closely by the shipwrights of Charleston. New York and Boston were not far behind in "requesting that heavy duties may be laid upon such articles as are manufactured by our own citizens, humbly conceiving that the impost is not solely considered by Congress as an object of revenue, but in its operation intended to exclude such importations and ultimately establish these several branches of manufacture among ourselves."

Nor was this feeling limited to tradesmen and mechanics alone. Statesmen, men whose names we are wont to venerate, stood shoulder to shoulder with them. James Madison was the one to bring the subject forward in Congress within one week from its first being convened, and in the debate upon it in the House of Representatives Fisher Ames said:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by a commercial necessity more than any other cause.

The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare.

Half a century later, when the subject was again agitated of "the power and duty of Congress to continue the policy of protecting American labor," Rufus Choate declared in the United States Senate that—

A whole people, a whole generation of our fathers, had in view as one grand end and purpose of their new Government the acquisition of the means of restraining by governmental action the importation of foreign manufactures, for the encouragement of manufactures and of labor at home, and desired and meant to do this by clothing the new Government with this specific power of regulating commerce.

And yet this checking or restricting of foreign importations which lay at the very foundation of our Government is that which apparently gives such great concern to the opponents of this bill. They lose no opportunity upon this floor to asseverate their devotion to the ideas of the framers of the Constitution, the organizers of this Government; yet in the most potent feeling and well-spring of action of the very men for whose memory and principles such devotion is professed they have no part or sympathy.

A century ago the well-being of the laborer by insuring him employment was the dominant idea; to-day our Democratic friends care more to see him clothed in cheap foreign woolen, unmindful of whether he has the means to secure it or not.

I have touched upon and endeavored to show the light in which this subject was regarded when these United States began their existence as

a distinct nation, the potent force the question exercised in the formation of the Constitution, and the attention it occupied in the minds of men at that time.

It would be easy to multiply quotations to the same effect from the debates in Congress and the utterances in the various States when the adoption of the Constitution was under discussion, but they would be only cumulative, not different in tone.

It would be both interesting and instructive to trace the commercial history of the century, with the transformations which the law has undergone at various times, noting how, as we approached nearer the free-trade idea, depression spread over our industries, to be repelled only by the raising of our import duties; but I must hasten on, for that has already been dwelt upon by others more fully and elaborately than time now permits me to do, and the phase I desire to present is whether to-day, with the changes of a century of phenomenal growth behind us, such a condition exists as calls for a modification of our system, or whether the principles of our forefathers are not as true to-day and should make us eager to perpetuate the system which their wisdom brought into being.

What, then, is the present condition? If we would believe the utterances which come from the other side of this Chamber, depression exists everywhere. The farmer is being eaten up by the interest on mortgages, because he can find no market for his crops. The mechanic is staggering under the burden of the protected American wool upon his back, each seeing starvation staring him in the face, because of a burden of taxation greater than ever was the load laid upon the shoulders of Atlas.

Indeed, so woful is the picture they paint that they pause between their rhetorical periods to catch the echo of the sobs of the down-trodden and oppressed which their imagination has depicted and marvel when the murmur which comes to their ears is that of the hum of industry.

Let us turn from the painting and view the facts. Prosperity and depression are but relative terms, and while no man upon this floor will say that the existing conditions are those which he views with complete satisfaction, while it must be admitted that there is much yet to be desired, the reality is far from one of inky blackness. Are they burning corn in Kansas? They have it not either to burn or eat in England.

Are farms under mortgage in Illinois? No tales come from there of the evictions and starvation such as the cable almost daily flashes from Ireland. Is there no market for our products? How then did we export commodities to the value of \$742,401,375 in the fiscal year ending June 30 last?

Why is it, if we are so sinking in the slough of depression, that even now our receiving facilities at the great seaboard ports are taxed to their utmost to handle the enormous tide of immigration which continually flows hither? Why is it that hundreds of thousands are annually leaving their homes in other lands to rear new firesides under our starry banner? From across the seas and from Canada they come. For what? Is it that they may become partakers of our burdens, sharers of our hardships? If such were the case it would be a sublime illustration of a carrying out of the divine injunction; but humanity the world over is a seething, struggling mass, where ethical ideas find few practical examples, and where the betterment of self-interests is a controlling motive, and those who are flocking hither to the extent of about a half million yearly come because, though depression may exist here, it is not such as they have known and suffered under elsewhere.

Such is the situation as it exists after an uninterrupted quarter of a century of applied protection, and the thriving industry of our own country, of which the evidences abound on every side, hand in hand with the so-called oppressive burdens, bear irrefutable testimony to the wisdom of the founders of this Government, amplified and maintained to-day, and to be continued, as I believe, for long years to come, maintained, not in a spasmodic way for the benefit or advantage of a favored few, but upon a distinct, recognizable plan for the interest of the many.

This vast nation is like a huge machine, where each, however humble, has his part to perform, and between each exists a clearly distinguishable interdependence. The farmer wants a protection, not merely for the products of his acres, but he wants the mechanic and artisan to enjoy it that they may become his purchasers, not be driven from the work-shops and factories to become his competitors. It is not the protection of the individual article, but the systematic plan carried into realization that means well-being.

I know a cry is going up—we heard it only yesterday in this very Hall—for foreign commerce; but what doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Give us free ships is a favorite cry of this school. Free ships, indeed. Do they not know that no nation on the face of the globe has as free ships as our own?

From the moment her keel touches the water we say to the American vessel, "Go where you please, sail in the tropics or the Arctic, but look for no aid or comfort from the land which has given you birth." And we say it, too, at a time when Great Britain is annually paying out vast sums of money to foster and encourage the shipping interests of her subjects.

Only a few months since an entire volume of the consular reports was

taken up with the figures of the governmental aid extended to the shipping of other lands, while for this purpose not one cent issues from our Treasury, and yet they cry, Give us free ships. Could anything be more misleading?

As I have said, the bill before us is not a patch-work; it is a plan for the systematic carrying out of a clearly defined idea. That it should encounter opposition is but natural; every measure of that sort must. The Mills bill two years ago had it to meet; but let me call attention to an example of the different quarter from which that opposition comes.

In 1888 the glass-blowers of my district were loud and vehement in their protests against what they looked upon as a threatening danger. It was not the voice of a trust or of a wealthy manufacturer, but of the men, who, as they stood beside their furnaces, heard with alarm the proposed reduction in the duty. They heard, and thought of their loved ones in their humble homes, and from the fullness of their hearts cried out.

To-day a protest has reached me against the glass schedule of this bill, but it comes not from these workmen. No; they have heard of the provisions of this bill and swing their glowing balls more merrily; but it comes from the importers of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, the men who find a living by bringing here the product of labor in foreign lands; from these comes the cry would you give this market to our own workmen and take it away from the starving, underpaid labor of other lands? And, for one, I have no hesitation in answering I would.

I do not profess that every provision in these schedules is what I would like to see it. I do not suppose that is the case with a single member upon this floor, not even with those whose wisdom fashioned the bill, and there are a few which I hope to see modified in the days to come, but I do recognize running through and permeating this measure the grand central idea of making the condition of the toiler in this country superior to that of those similarly engaged in any other nation on the face of this earth, a realization of the condition for which this Government was called into being, and as such I hail it, confident of the verdict of the American people.

It has been said that all the great religions of the world have originated in the East and all progress in political government in the West, and history attests the truth of the comparison. For a century the United States, the leading nation of the western hemisphere, has led the way for mankind in the rights of the individual citizen, in the transformation of him from a brute to a being. We have exerted an influence which has been felt around the globe, not merely in the matter of political advancement, but in material as well.

Others who looked on at first in doubt have learned to admire, then to follow in the path which we have marked out. Witnessing the benefits which have flowed from our economic policy, they have adopted a like line which brought material prosperity, and to-day Germany and France, Russia and Italy, nearly every nation of Continental Europe is to be classed among nations maintaining a protective policy, and with all the discontent which may exist within their borders their material prosperity was never greater.

Central Africa stands almost alone in holding aloft the banner of absolute free trade, yet even there the local potentate for a different purpose levies his tribute upon those who pass his boundaries. Everywhere are collected imposts from the foreigner, but it is the part of a beneficent Government like our own to so regulate them that they shall inure to the benefit of its citizens.

Are we, then, occupying the proud position we do, after a century of growth to take a backward step, to ignore the lessons of the past and enter upon a return to methods tried and found wanting, or shall we not rather continue in the van of economic progress, where we have been wont to lead the way, a guiding star for the wondering and admiring millions of other lands? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Mr. Chairman, from the formation of this Government until now the means and methods of raising revenue have necessarily engaged the thought and consideration of our greatest statesmen. Many times has the tariff been discussed in both Houses of Congress, and at this late day it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any one to throw additional light upon the questions involved in a bill of this character. I have no hope of doing so.

I doubt whether any man, however gifted he may be, and however extensive his researches may have been, can now present new ideas in regard to principles which should or should not obtain in the formation of a revenue measure; and, in entering upon the discussion of this subject, one is embarrassed with the thought that whatever he may say is but the repetition of an old story. I certainly have no desire to theorize about a "protective tariff" or a "tariff for revenue only," nor do I wish to talk very much about "fair trade," "fairer trade," or "free trade."

I am not a protectionist, nor do I advocate absolute free trade, but I do believe in tariff reform.

By tariff reform, I mean that impost duties should be so adjusted as not to create a greater revenue than is necessary for the payment of the expenses of the Government economically administered, and that in fixing these duties articles of necessity should as far as may be

compatible with the revenue interests of the Government be placed on the free-list, and, when this can not be done, that the duties upon such articles should be made as low as practicable. I wholly dissent from the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in his report upon this bill, wherein he says:

We have not been so much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been to encourage a system of home protection.

This is a clear-cut statement of the doctrine of "protection for the sake of protection" and a frank confession of adhesion to it in the preparation of this bill. I can but think that some consideration should be given to the rights of consumers, and especially to that large proportion of the 65,000,000 people in this country who are not engaged in manufacturing industries and who have at last to pay, not only the duty upon imported articles, but also the profit created by such duties upon the articles manufactured in this country. But we may not expect this of the party in power. A due consideration of the rights of those who are not engaged in manufacturing would utterly destroy the policy of "protection for the sake of protection."

I have no more reliable data than is furnished by the last census, and, although another decade has almost passed since that census was taken, it shows sufficiently well the injustice of the doctrine of "protection for the sake of protection." At the time when the last census was taken our people were engaged in all the industries, and it is instructive to ascertain how they were divided in the prosecution of these great industries:

	Persons.
In farming there were.....	7, 670, 493
In professional and personal service.....	4, 074, 238
In trade and transportation.....	1, 810, 256
In manufacturing, mechanics, and mining.....	3, 837, 112
Total earning livelihoods.....	17, 392, 099

There were 4,008,907 farms of the value of \$10,200,000,000. The capital invested in manufactures was \$2,790,272,806, showing that the capital invested in farms exceeded the capital invested in manufactures \$7,409,727,394.

These official figures show that there are twice as many farmers and farm laborers in the United States as there are mechanical, mining, and other industrial laborers. This vast army of farmers and farm laborers are all consumers of manufactured products. Why should not they and their wants receive due consideration by the Republican majority on the Ways and Means Committee?

The farmer is now giving the Republican party much embarrassment. The "grand old party" is at a loss to know how to manage him. In the past it has beguiled many of them with the idea that protection to the manufacturing interests of this country would be the means of creating a remunerative home market for farm products. This idea has failed to materialize, and when the tillers of the soil had to sacrifice their products in order to meet the "bills payable" at the store the capitalist and manufacturers of the East stepped forward and with a great display of magnanimity advanced them money upon good interest-bearing farm mortgages, and doubtless assured them that before the paper matured "the party of progress and of great moral ideas" would restore the planting interests to unwonted prosperity.

Yes, after taxing the farmer about 47 per cent. upon almost everything that he and his family necessarily use and consume, to swell the income of the manufacturers of the East, he is returned a part of his hard earnings for a short time by securing the ultimate payment thereof with accumulated interest by a mortgage upon his farm and home. This is not mere assertion. Eastern capital has been making these investments for years past. National banks, like other banking institutions, derive a large share of their profits from discounts and loans. If you will turn to page 12 of the last report of the Comptroller of the Currency, you will find this statement:

For example, if the group of States known as Division No. 6 is taken, composed of Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, it will be found that the capital of the five hundred and twenty associations in operation there on June 30, 1889, is represented by 647,501 shares, of which 212,305 are held by non-residents, mostly located in the extreme East. Now turn to page 13 of said report, and you will find this further statement from the Comptroller of the Currency: "In division No. 8, comprising the States and Territories known as North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Washington, Wyoming, and Arizona, it will be found that more than one-third of the total number of shares of national banks are held by non-residents.

A statement is being published in the papers said to be taken from the Bankers' Monthly, which gives the farm mortgages in some of the States as follows:

States.	Farm mortgages.	Interest.
Kansas.....	\$235,000,000	\$14,000,000
Indiana.....	645,000,000	38,700,000
Iowa.....	567,000,000	34,020,000
Michigan.....	500,000,000	30,000,000
Wisconsin.....	367,000,000	22,020,000
Ohio.....	1,127,000,000	67,620,000

I venture to make the assertion that there are but few national banks in existence whose stock is not largely held by Eastern capitalists. These capitalists, made rich by reaping the benefits of class legislation which has contributed so largely to the depreciation in value of farm products by enabling moneyed rings to control the prices of these products, are now seeking the foreclosure of their liens, and what shall the farmers do? The Democratic party desired to have this matter investigated, and early in this session Senator BERRY, of Arkansas, introduced in the Senate a bill to require the Superintendent of the Census to ascertain what percentage of the people own their farms, and the number of farms under mortgage, and the amount thereof. This bill created consternation in the Republican ranks, and General Porter, the Superintendent of the Census, a staunch Republican protectionist, at once addressed a letter to Senator BERRY in which he said:

These statistics can not be got from records, because there are no records in this country which on their face disclose the information; consequently the statistics can be got only by a house-to-house canvass.

Well, why not a house-to-house canvass? A house-to-house canvass had to be made to obtain other information, and why not get this information with the rest? Evidently the Superintendent of the Census and his party did not want this information. But the country demanded it, and the pressure became so great that the Superintendent of the Census found that it could be done. Whether there will be any "whitewashing" remains to be seen. Sometimes, when it costs nothing, a Republican can grow sweet upon the farmer.

I now read from the report made upon that iniquitous bill upon the Calendar of this House, commonly known as the lard bill, and if you have tears for the farmer, prepare to shed them now. The report says:

Your committee believe that no public interest at this time presses with such extreme urgency upon the attention of Congress as some measure of relief to the distresses of agriculture. This industry is the foundation of all our prosperity. All other trades rest in it like spokes in a hub and are bound to it with a tire of dependence. History gives no example of a country that survived its decay. This interest is now in alarming straits, hunted down, at bay, fighting for life.

All this gush about the farmer was caused by the mixing of hog's fat with pure cotton-seed oil, but it states no more than the truth about the farming industries of this country. Do you believe it? Take my own section, the South, where the staple production is cotton, and let figures show how the cotton producer has suffered and now suffers. The cotton crop of the Southern States in the year 1867 aggregated 2,097,257 bales and sold for \$279,354,232. In 1887 the cotton crop was 7,046,833 bales and sold for \$263,269,680.

These figures show that in 1887 there was more than three times as much cotton made as was made twenty years before in 1867, and it may be assumed that there were three times as much capital and labor employed in the making of the cotton crop of 1887 as were employed in 1867, and yet the crop of 1867 sold for more money than did the crop of 1887. These are incontrovertible facts and conclusively show that the cotton-producers in the South are in "alarming straits." Nor does this depression in the value of farm products exist alone in the South. It extends to the agricultural products of this entire country.

The Springfield Republican not long ago made the following statement in regard to the grain crop of the United States. It said:

The story of the wheat crop is best presented in a tabulated form, as follows:

Year.	Wheat yield.	Home value.
	Bushels.	
1889.....	490,560,000	\$346,000,000
1886.....	457,218,000	314,226,000
1885.....	357,112,000	275,320,380
1884.....	512,763,500	330,861,254
1883.....	421,086,160	388,648,272
1882.....	504,185,470	444,602,125
1881.....	383,280,090	453,790,427
1880.....	498,450,868	474,201,850
1879.....	459,483,137	509,269,773

This must be counted a remarkable exhibit. Wheat production is not increasing, but relatively decreasing. The yield of 1884 remains the maximum of record, with that of 1882 the nearest approach to it. But prices instead of increasing have been steadily declining. The smaller crop of 1879 brought \$150,000,000 more to the farmers than that of 1889. A crop of 100,000,000 bushels less in 1881 brought \$100,000,000 more than in 1889. A crop of 14,000,000 bushels more in 1882 brought nearly \$100,000,000 more than in 1889. For four years prior to 1883 the wheat crop of the country never failed to yield at the point of production over \$400,000,000; since then it has never approached those figures.

Nor is the story of the corn crop any the less significant. For the seven years prior to 1886, this crop, averaging more than \$30,000,000 bushels less than for 1889, brought to the farmer a revenue greater by from \$30,000,000 to over \$170,000,000, the average excess of value being over \$60,000,000 a year.

The oat crop has been steadily increasing from 407,000,000 bushels in 1879 to 730,000,000 bushels in 1889, but the aggregate value has advanced only from \$150,000,000 in 1879 and \$193,000,000 in 1880 to \$188,000,000 in 1886 and \$167,000,000 in 1889.

In other words, while population in the United States has been increasing from 50,000,000 to about 62,000,000, while consumption and demand have been growing in equal proportion and demand all over the world expanding, and while the wheat supply in the United States remains stationary, values decline rather than advance. With no more than an equal supply and a rapidly increasing demand, the farmer is getting less and less for his wheat, and with consumption increasing faster than the supply is increasing, he gets less and less for his corn. And in the face of this stationary supply of wheat and grow-

ing demand the president of the Chicago Board of Trade declares that prices have fallen so low and the cereal movement has become so sluggish as to seriously affect the business of the exchange.

Here is an anomaly in production which ought to set people who are pondering over the farm problem to thinking in new directions. Why, in the face of a stationary supply and increasing demand, should prices decline? What other business in the United States outside of agriculture is subject to so extraordinary a deviation from the natural laws of trade? How long can the Western farmer, under these conditions, keep up the pace set by the mortgage loans with which he has so liberally availed himself. In view of the facts here set forth we can readily believe the reports coming with increasing frequency from the agricultural sections of the West of a deep-seated and spreading feeling of discontent among the farmers over prevailing conditions which portends a profound commercial and political disturbance.

Every one admits that agriculture is in a languishing condition, and it is the duty of the hour to ascertain the cause of its depression and to apply the remedy. Who has hunted the farmer down? Who has put him at bay? Who has caused him to fight—no, not to fight, but to plead for his life? My answer is that it is the party which has controlled the financial policy of this country for more than a quarter of a century.

The Republican party is not justly chargeable with the public debt, for that was caused by the war between the States, but the Republican party is chargeable with the manner in which that debt has been so manipulated as to enrich the few and to impoverish the many. No intelligent man can doubt that wealth has been concentrated in the hands of comparatively a few persons. In the last September number of the Forum appeared an article entitled "Henry George's mistakes," written by Thomas G. Shearman, in which this statement is made:

As lately as 1847 there was but one man in this country who was reputed to be worth more than \$5,000,000; and, though some estimated his wealth at \$20,000,000, there is no good reason for believing it to have been so great. The wealth of his lineal descendants is estimated at \$250,000,000, or over \$50,000,000 each. In 1897, in the New York constitutional convention, one of the most prominent delegates stated that he could name thirty men residing in that State whose wealth averaged \$15,000,000 each. The St. Louis Globe recently published a list of seventy-two persons who were worth collectively the whole of our national debt, averaging \$18,000,000 each.

The wealthiest railroad manager in America in 1865 was worth \$40,000,000, but not more. His heir died recently leaving an estate of nearly \$200,000,000, and there are several gentlemen now living who are worth over \$100,000,000 each. Within a short period a number of quiet, unobtrusive men of no national fame have died in Pennsylvania leaving estates of over \$20,000,000 each. Twenty living persons in the oil business are reputed to be as rich. Forty persons could be easily named none of them worth less than \$20,000,000 and averaging \$40,000,000 each. At the lowest reasonable estimate there must now be more than two hundred and fifty persons in this country whose wealth averages over \$20,000,000 for each.

But let us call the number only two hundred. Income-tax returns in Great Britain and the United States show that, in general, the number of incomes, when arranged in large classes, multiplies by from three to five fold for every reduction in the amount of one-half. For extreme caution, however, we estimate the increase in the number of incomes at a very much lower rate than this. At this reduced rate the amount of wealth in the hands of persons worth over \$500,000 each in the United States would be about as follows:

200 persons at \$20,000,000.....	\$4,000,000,000
400 persons at \$10,000,000.....	4,000,000,000
1,000 persons at \$5,000,000.....	5,000,000,000
2,000 persons at \$2,500,000.....	5,000,000,000
6,000 persons at \$1,000,000.....	6,000,000,000
15,000 persons at \$500,000.....	7,500,000,000

Total..... 31,500,000,000

This estimate is very far below the actual truth. Yet, even upon this basis, we are confronted with the startling result that 25,000 persons now possess more than half of the whole national wealth, real and personal, according to the highest estimate (\$60,000,000,000) which any one has yet ventured to make of the aggregate amount. Nor is this conclusion at all improbable.

The author of this article is a man of national reputation, which he would not imperil by making assertions not warranted by facts.

This is a startling statement, but I doubt not that it is correct, or very nearly so. Think of a great Republic, with a population of not less than 65,000,000, and one-half of the entire wealth owned by 25,000 persons. I make no war upon wealth and have no sympathy with socialism, but I am free to say that I do not believe that this great wealth could be aggregated in the hands of such a small number of persons while the farming and other laboring elements of the country are in sore distress if the Government had adopted and pursued a wise financial policy, if legislation had been for the whole people instead of the privileged few.

The owners of this great wealth contribute but little to the support of the Government. Their property for the most part consists of non-taxable interest-bearing securities, and their purchases of commodities upon which the Government has placed a tax in most instances do not exceed those of men in ordinary circumstances. Great numbers of these very wealthy people are manufacturers and reap the benefits of taxation that the farmer and others have to pay. They are the great American industries that are so tenderly cared for by the Republican party. Oh for an income tax that will reach them and make them bear their just burden of the Government!

The public debt reached its maximum on the 21st of August, 1865, and the interest-bearing portion of it then amounted to \$2,383,033,315. On the 31st of October, 1889, this interest-bearing debt had been reduced to \$852,635,172, so that in less than twenty-five years the people, the producers, the farmers of this country, by onerous and oppressive taxation have been compelled to pay \$1,530,398,143 of this interest-bearing debt.

Nor is this all, for in addition to this vast sum the people of this

country have paid about all of the non-interest-bearing national debt and besides have borne the burdens of taxation to defray the expenses of the Federal Government and of their respective State and county governments, as well as many other taxes imposed by various municipal authorities. What it would all aggregate I do not know, but I do know that it has been an enormous burden upon all, save the manufacturing industries of this country, and has almost crushed the agricultural interest.

Taxation is more burdensome to agriculture than to any other industry, for the farmer has to pay not only his own taxes, but is compelled to contribute very largely to the payment of taxes imposed upon others. It nearly all falls upon the plow-holder. There is no escape for him. The consumer is the one who pays the taxes. Others all along the line can protect themselves, but the one who consumes the article taxed must pay to his vendor not only the cost of previous handlings, but the taxes included, and, as the agriculturists are by far the most numerous in this country, the burden of such taxation as is provided for by the pending bill falls more heavily upon them.

No good citizen objects to the payment of such taxes as may be necessary to pay the legitimate expenses of Government, but when the taxing power is exercised for other than governmental purposes, to enable certain industries to contend with competitors, it is an assumption of power not warranted by the organic law, is vicious in principle and oppressive to the people, and should meet with their disapproval. The enormous taxation which has been borne by the country has inured to the benefit of those in whose behalf the public debt was manipulated by the Republican party; and these privileged persons, to increase their wealth, have ever sought and too frequently obtained such legislation as would contract the volume of the circulating medium in order to increase the purchasing power of money and to make the price of products correspondingly low.

Mr. Chairman, imported oil paintings hang upon the walls of the rich and sculptured marble is found only in the mansions of the wealthy, yet by this bill they are placed on the free-list. Perhaps this was done for the benefit of the twenty-five thousand who it is said own one-half of all the property in this country, and they must be further provided for by being allowed to import from Europe their pictures and statuary free from duty. No tax of any kind must they pay for the support of Government.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Texas permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. Certainly.
Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Has not the gentleman's attention been called to the fact that there was a similar provision in the Mills bill as to the admission of works of art?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. So much the worse. I do not defend the free admission of luxuries under any bill, when the necessities of life are taxed. [Applause.] John Smith, the farmer, is compelled to pay taxes on everything that he and his wife and children have, use, and wear; but Mr. Maurice Algernon Vernon, the millionaire, imports from Europe copies of the old masters with which to adorn his palatial home, free of duty; yet this is "The best Government the world ever saw."

Mr. MCKINLEY, in his report, says:
The committee have given months of investigation to the existing conditions of agriculture and matters connected therewith.

It is strange that such an investigation did not stay the heavy hand of taxation that has so long been laid on the farmer. In another place he says:

A critical examination of the subject will show that agriculture is suffering chiefly from a most damaging competition in our home market. The increase of importations of agricultural products since 1850 has been enormous, amounting from \$40,000,000 to more than \$356,000,000 in 1889.

It will be seen that he takes a period of nearly forty years in which this increase was made, during which time he says the population of the country increased less than 300 per cent., and it is to be observed that Mr. MCKINLEY furnishes no bill of particulars in this connection showing in what these importations of agricultural products consisted. Is it at all strange that during a period in which our population increased with such amazing rapidity the importations of such agricultural products as sugar, coffee, and the tropical fruits, none of which, except sugar, can be successfully grown in this country, should have largely increased?

Mr. Chairman, when the Republican majority of the Committee on Ways and Means were giving "months of investigation to the existing conditions of agriculture and matters connected therewith," it would have been no more than right for them to direct their eyes towards the South with no unkindly spirit. It may be said that the South pays not less than one-third of the revenues of this Government and gets but little of it back in the disbursement of the public funds. Of the vast sum that is expended for pensions, now amounting to more than \$100,000,000 annually, the South receives but little.

The disbursement of the pension fund among the people of the North very largely contributes to their prosperity, but pensions only assist in impoverishing the people of the South; but of this the South has not complained. The matchless energies of her people have enabled the

South to bear these burdens. But the people of the South have the right to ask for at least fair treatment in the preparation of a bill like the one under consideration.

Is there anything in the pending bill that will help the agricultural interests of the South? If there is I have not been able to find it. Cotton is the staple production in most of the Southern States, but as it has no foreign competition, for no cotton is imported to this country, it has received no consideration in this measure, although the cultivation of cotton is one of our largest industries and is also one of our largest exports. I have before called your attention to the fact that the farmers engaged in raising cotton have suffered much from the depression in prices. Why not relieve the cotton-growers of a part of the onerous taxation imposed upon them? Will it be said that the placing of jute and jute butts on the free-list will relieve them?

I doubt whether it will do so to any appreciable extent; but if bagging manufactured for wrapping cotton and the iron ties used therewith had been placed on the free-list, it would have been of much benefit to the cotton-planter. But the committee would not do that, because it would interfere with some of the "American industries," to the maintenance of which the people of the South must be made to contribute by onerous taxation.

Sugar is another Southern product. In the State of Texas there is an area of territory larger than the State of Louisiana which is capable of growing sugar. There are some very large sugar plantations in my State, and the growing of sugar is a matter in which the people of Texas have much interest. In the near future it promises to be one of our large industries. In the last fiscal year the total amount of revenue derived from custom duties amounted to \$223,832,741.69, and of this amount the duties on sugar and molasses furnished the sum of \$55,975,610. But, notwithstanding one-fourth of the entire revenue has been derived from sugar and molasses, this bill places these articles on the free-list.

Do our Republican friends of the Committee on Ways and Means understand that Southern industries are included in the term "American industries?" It is true that a bounty of 2 cents per pound is to be paid on sugar up to a certain grade that may be produced in this country for the next fifteen years.

This bounty system is all wrong and no such precedent should be established. It is claimed that bounties will encourage the production of sugar; that they will lead to such development of the sorghum and sugar-beet industries as will supply the people of the United States with all the sugar they need by the time the fifteen years expire.

Whether the juice from sorghum can be granulated into sugar at such cost as to make its use practicable depends upon the inventive genius of man, and no bounty will bring it about, nor will it incite further or more strenuous efforts in that direction. The exclusive privileges of a patent give greater profit to the inventor than a bounty conferred upon the grower, and when the process of making sugar from sorghum is rendered practicable it will require no bounty from the Government to induce the farmers to grow it. Soil and climate are the indispensable requisites for successful culture of the sugar-beet, and when these are found aid from the Government will not be required.

Why should the man who raises wheat or corn or cotton be taxed to provide a bounty for the man who raises sugar? I do not perceive why the corn-grower may not as well be taxed for the benefit of the sugar-grower as to be taxed for the benefit of the wool-grower and for the benefit of the manufacturer of woolen goods. The sugar-grower needs as much protection from the cheap labor of the West Indies and other sugar-growing countries as do those who manufacture glassware or woolen goods from what the protectionists are pleased to call the "pauper labor of Europe."

But it is all wrong. It is class legislation. No industry should be taxed in order to increase the profits of another industry. It is not fair play. I do not think there is any sincere belief on the part of many that bounties on sugar will be long paid. Such legislation is presented at this time to let the sugar industry "down easy." I would not be surprised if the bounty clause was repealed at the next session of Congress. If there is any one who believes that bounties on sugar will be paid for the next fifteen years I think his credulity is far greater than his judgment.

I do not wish from these remarks to be understood as defending the present duties on sugar, for I am no more a protectionist at the South than I am at the North, and nowhere is the doctrine of "protection for the sake of protection" right. I think the duty on sugar should be reduced to at least the extent made in the Mills bill, but I do wish to be distinctly understood as protesting against the unjust discrimination made in the pending bill against the industries of the South.

The majority report which accompanies this bill justifies the action of the committee in placing sugar on the free-list, because "it is an article of prime necessity as food." Salt is also an article of "prime necessity as food" and is not on the free-list. It may be true that there is not as much salt required for family use as there is of sugar; but even that is doubtful. It is found in all the smoke-houses of the farmers and is in more universal use than sugar. Salt is used by both man and beast, and in all the great packing-houses of the North it is

an article of indispensable necessity. Not long since I read the following statement in a newspaper:

The great packing firm of Armour & Co., of Chicago, import all the salt that they use in packing from Canada, and pay duty at the rate of 8 cents per sack and 12 cents per barrel; then when they have packed their pork with it and export their pork, they, under the ruling of the Treasury Department, receive their duty back on the number of pounds of salt in each barrel. This rebate I was informed amounted to nearly a million of dollars per annum.

I do not know whether this statement is true or false, but it serves to show the extensive use of salt. It is not only used in packing-houses, but in canneries and in various kinds of manufacturing establishments to be found in the Northern States. If sugar is placed on the free-list because it is an article of prime necessity I fail to see why salt also should not be made free. Salt is mostly manufactured in the North; sugar and molasses are mostly manufactured in the South. Rice is exclusively a Southern product, and has found no protection at the hands of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, but foreign competition has been invited by a reduction of the duty on this article.

Cotton-growers, sugar-growers, and rice-growers of the South certainly form no part of the agricultural interests to which the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means "gave months of investigation." The South can stand it, and will submit to these unjust discriminations against her agricultural industries, with the hope that a better policy will prevail even with those who now shape the legislation of the country.

Mr. Chairman, no more transparent fraud was ever attempted than is now being made by the Republican party in its effort to create the impression that the farmers of this country have been seriously damaged by the importation of agricultural products from other countries. The grain imported from Canada and other countries for planting and for other purposes is a mere bagatelle to the annual surplus of grain in this country for which no living price can be obtained. What the farmer needs is relief from the so-called "protection" given to him by the Republican party.

Cheapen those articles that he and his family are compelled to eat or to wear and the utensils with which they must work in the house and in the field, and upon which you now compel him to pay a tax of not less than 47 per cent., and you will contribute more to his happiness and prosperity than you will ever accomplish by excluding cabbages from Canada or Spanish ponies from Mexico. When you attempt to discount the intellectual force and intelligence of the agriculturists of this country you make a great mistake. They will be quick to see the fraud that is attempted to be imposed upon them by this tariff bill, and in their own way and at the proper time will let you know it.

I have spoken thus far in behalf of the farmer, but there are others who "in the sweat of their faces eat bread." The question of labor in these United States has ever been connected with revenue measures. No one need be told that in the early days of this Republic the only defense urged in behalf of a protective tariff were the benefits to accrue therefrom to our "infant industries;" and if we are to believe our Republican friends the manufacturing industries of this country are still in their swaddling clothes.

I am sure I never heard a speech or read an article in behalf of a protective tariff which did not claim that high protective duties were necessary for American labor. The benefits that will accrue to American laborers form the staple arguments of all protectionists, and without it Othello's occupation would be gone. I have never believed that a protective tariff was of any benefit to an American workman or to any one except the capitalist whose money was invested in manufacturing industries, nor have I had the slightest apprehension that American labor in this country could be injured by cheap labor in Europe.

Every intelligent man is bound to admit that there have been more labor troubles in the last twenty-five years in this country than were ever known before. There have been more lock outs, strikes, and contentions of every kind between employers and employes than was ever before known, and all these things have occurred during the existence of the Morrill war tariff, the highest protective tariff that has ever been in existence in the United States.

Will some protectionist explain why all this discontent and trouble have occurred during a period of high protection? It has been during this period that labor organizations have arisen.

Men belonging to these organizations will tell you truly that the causes which render such organizations not only worthy, but absolutely necessary, are, "First, the domination of capital; second, the inequalities of wealth and poverty before the law; third, the discriminations and exorbitancy of our system of taxation." Will any one deny that these causes exist? Does not every observing man know that they do exist? Yes, it is too true that the struggle for life is becoming more desperate and labor has been compelled to organize for resistance to the domination of capital.

Mr. Chairman, these labor organizations do much good; they are educating the masses in regard to the practical questions of the day, and their hard experience and daily observations constitute a great store of learning to them of far more practical value than learned essays upon

the subject of political economy. It was but the other day that I clipped from a labor paper the following:

Another source of social disorder is the inequality of our system of taxation. If our direct system is vicious, our indirect system is outrageous. Though the wealth is centered in the few the taxes are borne by the many. A poor man is taxed upon the face value of his freehold. The bondholder and the monopolist, worth untold millions and living in a brownstone front upon some fashionable avenue, hand in their figures for assessment. And need I say that they are very kind to themselves?

And now permit me to say a word in regard to our indirect system, which is misnamed a protective tariff. It is only protective inasmuch as it protects the rich and burdens the needy. Our present tariff has been defined, and well, as a "tax which pillages the many to enrich the few." It affords protection to a few manufacturers upon our coast to the detriment of a majority of our people. While the price of manufactured articles is increased, there is no corresponding increase in wages. "A tariff discriminates against labor in favor of capital."

This is the truth and nothing but the truth told in a few words. I rejoice to know that the farmers, the mechanics, and all the workers of this land are investigating these practical questions in politics—questions that so materially affect their business relations and success in life—for I know they will find the truth, and truth will dissipate the heresies of a protective tariff. It would be strange, indeed, if some errors should not creep into these labor organizations, but we may rely with perfect confidence upon their great common sense and experience in practical affairs to correct their mistakes. It is a great error upon the part of some belonging to these organizations to impute the wrongs under which they and the whole country suffer to both of the great political parties now in existence.

The Democratic party is not justly chargeable with any of the evils which afflict the country. It should be remembered that the country is now suffering from the effects of class legislation that has been enacted since the Republican party came into authority, and that at no time since the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln in March, 1861, have the Democrats had at any one period the President and both Houses of Congress, and that it has not been within the power of the Democratic party to relieve the country from the evils under which it has suffered from the class legislation of the Republican party, a party which has faithfully represented associated capital and corporate power.

The history of the Democratic party will show that it has ever been the determined foe of class legislation and has always endeavored to have the Government so administered as to lighten the burden of taxation, and to legislate for no particular or privileged class, but for the good of all, and it may be trusted to work in the future for that for which it has so faithfully labored in the past.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Mr. Chairman, no issue in American politics has been so much discussed as the tariff, and at no time have the people abated in their zeal in reference to this issue except when they have been confronted with the problems incident to war. This is all very natural because the greater part of our revenue raised for the support and maintenance of our Federal Government has always been derived from a tax laid upon imported goods. During the last fiscal year the aggregate revenues of our Government were \$387,050,000, and of this sum \$223,832,000 was collected on dutiable goods.

Sir, there are at least two very good and patent reasons why the tariff has been an interesting and perplexing issue. First and primarily the people have always regarded the taxing power with jealousy, because they know full well that this power is one of the highest and most sacred with which their Representatives have to do. And, secondly, the apparently selfish manner in which these rates of tax have been laid upon different articles of import at different times has filled a very large number of our tax-payers and fellow-citizens with a spirit of unrest and righteous indignation.

For more than seventy years a comparatively small minority of our fellow-citizens have from time to time constantly clamored for special favor under what is known as the so-called protective system, and all legislation looking to the perpetuation of this system is deservedly open to the criticism that it is class legislation. It is the taxing of the masses of our people for the benefit of a favored class. Not only is this so, but this system has had the effect to break down and cripple other equally valuable industries and avocations.

Mr. Webster in 1824 said:

With me it is a fundamental axiom, it is interwoven with all my opinions, that the great interests of the country are united and inseparable; that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures will prosper together or languish together, and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking at the consequences which will fall upon the others. All domestic industry is not confined to manufactures. The employments of agriculture, commerce, and navigation are all branches of the same domestic industry; they all furnish employment for American capital and American labor. And when the question is whether new duties shall be laid for the purpose of giving further encouragement to particular manufactures every reasonable man must ask himself whether it can be given without injustice to other branches of industry.

What Mr. Webster then portentously saw we now realize: the fact by the year 1860 our foreign commerce excelled that of any other nation of the world, and the art of navigation was the delight of our seamen! After thirty years of this high-tax policy our merchant marine, which is the very soul of our commerce, is the mere shadow of its former self. Navigation with us is a lost art. Agriculture, which in 1860 controlled and owned one-half the wealth of this nation, perhaps does not to-day own and control one-fourth its wealth.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have spent much time in the candid consideration of matters which affect this fundamental pursuit, and in my judgment the great body of our agricultural people are in a more unrestful and unsatisfactory condition to-day than ever before in the history of our country, and in this I am sure I voice the judgment of that committee.

Sir, this should not be so. Agriculture is our people's greatest and foremost vocation. It is the foundation of our nation's wealth. This is true because agriculture produces very largely the raw materials for the manufacturer, and the products of the farm and manufacture constitute the very blood of commerce. Was not Mr. Webster right in 1824 when he predicted that undue encouragement to particular manufactures would prove injurious to agriculture and our foreign carrying trade?

After thirty years of high protective duties we are confronted with an object lesson, showing the condition of our three co-ordinate industrial vocations, agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. Once they all went hand in hand in generous rivalry; once each was the friendly and natural complement of the others; once they all prospered together, but to-day they all languish together.

Sir, they worse than languish together, because it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that one member of this glorious wealth-producing triumvirate is substantially dead, our foreign carrying trade. Thirty years ago thousands and tens of thousands of our brave fellow-citizens were employed in the carrying of goods to and from the different nations of the earth in American vessels. To-day our commercial greatness is but a memory.

Is foreign commerce necessary now to our prosperity? Has the condition of our people so changed in the past thirty years that we do not need commerce? But a single observation answers these questions. We now produce substantially one-third of the coal, iron ore, pig-iron, finished iron and steel, and one-fourth the wheat that are produced in the world, and yet we have but the twenty-fifth part of the earth's population. Not only is this so, but we produce annually for export more than \$500,000,000 worth of farm products, consisting in the main of breadstuffs, provisions, raw cotton, tobacco, and live animals.

Mr. Chairman, shall we approve this high-tax bill and refuse to buy from the nations of the earth, and thereby encourage them to close their ports and markets against what we have to sell? When we refuse to buy from them, they in turn will refuse to buy from us. And thus continues the interminable conflict in which lie the death of commerce, the paralysis of agriculture, and the cultivation of the most consummate selfishness among our manufacturers. [Applause.] Is it right that this bill should become a law and lay additional tax burdens upon an already overtaxed people and further embarrass trade and menace commerce, or should we retrace our steps and again place upon the statute-books a tariff for revenue?

A tariff for revenue is just because it is in harmony with the wisdom of the fathers. They believed that our laws should be so framed as to do equal and exact justice to all and give special privileges to none. A revenue tariff properly adjusted would remove the tax upon raw materials out of which ships are constructed. It would graciously invite tens of thousands of our fellow-citizens to go forth on the sea, and like contented atoms of life float in the arteries and veins bearing the rich blood of commerce. A revenue tariff would invite our blast furnaces, rolling-mills, iron and steel plants to take their products, rolled, hammered, and bent in a thousand shapes, all useful to the needs of men, and to trade their products to the people of other countries.

Sir, the people of South America need and want our railway iron and locomotives, farming implements and machinery, cutlery and tools, cotton and woolen goods, tobacco and cordage, provisions, cured meats, wines, preserved fruits, flour, boots and shoes, pianos, sewing-machines, and petroleum. In fact, they need and want almost every article known to the skill and industry of our inventive people, and for these things so singularly indispensable to the uses of man they would most willingly trade us coffee, hides, raw wool, sugar, indigo, dye-wood, rubber, fertilizers, cinchona bark, and many other articles as equally indispensable to us.

Moreover, our trade would not be confined to South America, but, like an endless chain of endless good, it would girdle the globe as it did in years long gone by. [Applause.]

Again was Mr. Webster correct when he said that too much encouragement to particular manufactures would cause them to languish. The census reports show that the number of manufacturing establishments in the United States increased in number 17,408 from 1850 to 1860, and 111,715 from 1860 to 1870, and but 1,704 from 1870 to 1880. The number of manufactures increased in number sixty-five times as fast from 1860 to 1870 as from 1870 to 1880. The capital invested in manufacturing establishments increased from 1850 to 1860 about 90 per cent., and from 1860 to 1870 more than 109 per cent., and from 1870 to 1880 less than 33 per cent.

What is the legitimate inference to be drawn from these census facts? They prove that during the revenue-tariff years both the number of manufacturing establishments and the capital invested in them had a natural and healthful growth, but immediately after the year 1860, when they received undue encouragement at the hands of our Govern-

ment, capital, in many instances, was improvidently invested in manufactures. In a word, manufacturing establishments, immediately after 1860, were not called into existence by natural and healthful conditions, but very largely they were born of an artificial stimulus.

Prior to 1860 the Government, speaking by law, said: All the industries and vocations of my people shall stand equally before the law, and all shall be treated with equal favor. Subsequent to 1860 the Government said to the manufacturers, I will protect and nourish you; you are my especial favorites. Thousands of our fellow-citizens, influenced by this artificial stimulus, rushed into manufacturing. And so we had scarcely entered upon the decade commencing in 1870 when we began to hear of overproduction.

With overproduction came the filling of the warehouses with manufactured goods for which purchasers could not be found. With it came a crash of private fortunes which was felt in every home. With it came the custom of running furnaces and mills on half time or third time. With the shutting of the mills came lockouts, and with lockouts came tramps. Out of all this wreck of fortunes, perplexity, and stagnation succeeding 1870, and which will forever distinguish the decade from 1870 to 1880, came the combine and the trust.

The Government's chosen beneficiaries, who are now confederated in combines and trusts, do not, according to the Darwinian theory, represent the survival of the fittest, but they represent the survival of the wealthiest and the strongest. Combines and trusts in the main are the direct outgrowth of our high tax policy. The relevancy of a high tariff to trusts is evident and simple. A high tariff prevents importations of protected manufactures, and the manufacturers, being thus protected from competition from abroad, enter into a combine or trust the prime objects of which are to limit the amount and supply of goods to be sold to the public, and also to fix the price to be paid for such goods, without reference to the cost of production, and also at the same time to assail and break down all domestic competition. Thus by an unwise tariff policy we have brought into existence combines and trusts representing vast accumulations of wealth in the hands of a few persons.

Mr. Chairman, wealth is power. It is said in holy writ that the "Rich ruleth the poor, and the borrower is a servant of the lender." The wisdom of this divine injunction is more evident to-day than ever before in the history of our country. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of the leading Republican papers of the West, on the 8th day of last August, said:

A good many Democratic papers just now are busy accusing the Globe-Democrat and other Republican journals of inconsistency in demanding that duties be lowered on articles controlled by trusts; we are accused of infidelity to party and treachery to the cause of protection. The few Republican papers, too, which remain silent on the question, or which imagine that the individuals at the heads of these combines can be coaxed by honeyed phrases or appeals to their honesty or patriotism to discontinue their oppression of the people, also charge us with rashness with tampering with the tariff.

It was understood, of course, that the tariff would increase the price of commodities to the consumer, but the expectation was that the domestic competition which the tariff would create would eventually lower prices to the foreign level, or near it. This was the intention of the men who first put our tariff laws on the national statute-book.

On no other ground can the tariff be reasonably and logically defended. With the entire spirit and intent of the protective policy the trust system is at war.

When Mr. Blaine, during the Presidential canvass last year, said that "trusts were private affairs," the Globe-Democrat promptly and unsparingly condemned that utterance.

This journal took the same ground a year earlier when the sugar combine came into being. We said then if trusts formed in any commodities on which duties are levied could not be crushed readily without striking them at the custom-house, they should be struck at that point vigorously and remorselessly. This position we have maintained from that time onward, and we have had the satisfaction of seeing nearly every conspicuous Republican newspaper in the country take this ground since then and hold it.

And the Republicans of Iowa in their State platform in 1889—

Resolved, That we demand of Congress the protection of American industry when it does not foster trusts and trade conspiracies.

Mr. Chairman, the friends of a high tariff are compelled by the conditions which confront them to concede that the tariff has fostered trusts and that trusts have broken down competition. Not only is competition broken down so far as rival industries are concerned, but competition, which is the very soul of trade, has ceased to be a factor in the labor market. When individuals form a trust they cease to bid against each other for labor. They simply agree among themselves what the trust will pay for labor; so labor must accept the wages fixed by the trust or go unemployed.

Mr. Garfield, on the 6th day of March, 1878, in this House, said:

In 1860 the burdens of national taxation were light. All our revenues, including loans, amounted only to \$76,000,000. Our expenditures were \$77,000,000, and our whole public debt but \$65,000,000. In the year 1860 the tonnage of our ships upon the seas was 5,353,868 tons, which was more by 140,000 tons than in any other year of our history before or since. Two-thirds of our imports were then carried in American bottoms, as were also more than two-thirds of our exports.

Our exports that year reached the aggregate value of \$400,000,000, which was forty-three and a half millions more than during any previous year. Our imports were \$362,000,000, decidedly more than any other year. And I make this statement on the authority of David A. Wells, that in 1860 we were exporting to foreign countries more American manufactures than in any other year of our history. In a table printed on page 10 of the report of the special commissioner of the revenue for 1869, it appears that in 1860 there came to this country 179,000 emigrants, 58,000 more than during the preceding year.

As an exhibit of the activity and industry of our people, forty-eight hundred and nineteen patents were issued at the Patent Office in 1860, eleven hundred more than the average number for the three years preceding. In that year we built 1,846 miles of railroad, a slight increase above the preceding year. The people of the United States consumed 332,000 tons of sugar in 1857, and in 1860 they consumed the enormous amount of 464,000 tons, more than in any other year of our previous history. The mean annual consumption of tea in the United States, which was 16,000,000 pounds in the decade ending with 1850, was 27,000,000 pounds in the decade ending with 1860. This certainly is an indication that the people had something to buy with.

From 1831 to 1851 the cotton crop of the United States ranged from one million to two and one-third million bales per annum. In the year 1860 it had risen to the enormous crop of 4,675,770 bales, almost a million more bales than were ever grown in the United States in any previous year of our history.

I find from the census reports that in 1850 our wheat crop was 100,000,000 bushels and in 1860 it was 173,000,000 bushels. In 1850 we raised 592,000,000 bushels of corn; in 1860, 838,000,000 bushels, while in 1870 we raised but 700,000,000. The crop of 1860 was 78,000,000 bushels more than that of 1870 and 346,000,000 more than that of 1850. And so with several other of the great cereals. The crop of barley for 1860 was three times that of 1850. The crops of rye and buckwheat in 1860 exceeded those of 1870 as well as those of 1850.

In 1850 the value of the American farms was three and one quarter billions of dollars; in 1860 it was \$6,645,000,000, an increase of 103 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. during that decade.

The value of farming implements in 1850, was \$151,000,000; in 1860, it was \$246,000,000, an increase of 70 per cent.; while during the next decade it increased but 42 per cent. From the statistics of manufactures given in the census I find that in 1850 957,000 hands were employed; in 1860, 1,311,000. In 1850 the capital invested in manufactures amounted to \$533,000,000; in 1860, \$1,009,000,000, an increase of 90 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. The products of our manufactures increased in that decade \$870,000,000. But the gentleman tells us it was a year of unusual distress.

He spoke of the condition of the iron interest in that year. Let me tell him what the Iron and Steel Associations say in their report for 1877. I find on page 28 that in 1860 there were brought from Lake Superior to our mills in the East 116,000 tons of ore, 51,000 tons more than in any other year of our history.

On page 47 of the same report I learn that the production of anthracite coal in Pennsylvania in 1860 amounted to 9,807,000 tons, almost 800,000 tons more than in any previous year.

On page 12 of the same report I find that the production of bituminous coal and coke for 1860 amounted to 122,000 tons, which was 33,000 tons more than the greatest product of any preceding year. And how much pig-iron did we produce in that year? I quote from page 302 of the volume of Speeches and Addresses by William D. Kelley—a speech made by him here January 11, 1870, in which he gives the product for seven or eight years; and, according to his speech, in the year 1860 the total product of pig-iron in this country was 913,000 tons. This was 130,000 tons more than the average of the six preceding years, yet he holds that 1860 was a year of unusual distress.

We can find ample ground for the sufficient protection of American manufacturers without distorting the history of our country. The gentleman's position lays him open to this dangerous reply, that if the low tariff and insufficient volume of currency of 1860 caused the alleged distress of that year, how will he account for what he admits, the great distress of 1877, with a much higher tariff and three times the currency of 1860?

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. The aggregate volume of real and personal property in the United States in 1850 was in round millions \$7,135,000,000; in 1860 it was \$16,159,000,000, an increase of 126 per cent., while the population increased but 35 per cent. Yet to suit a theory of finance we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business, equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have ventured to quote at great length from Mr. Garfield in order to prove by his splendid collation of facts that the charge often made that our country was not prosperous and happy under a revenue tariff is absolutely false. In the light of history and the conditions which now confront us, I contend in all sincerity that this so-called protective system has proven prejudicial and disastrous to the masses of our people.

In 1860 our people had lived for fourteen consecutive years under a tariff for revenue. In those days, when the burdens of taxation were light, combines and trusts, lock-outs and strikes, were things unknown. Sir, in those days, I repeat, our domestic manufactures were in generous and healthy competition. To-day many of them are banded together in trusts and thereby have become arrant and defiant monopolies, in the slimy folds of which competition has long since strangled and died.

Under this system our manufacturers in many instances seem to have lost their spirit of self-reliance. Continually they clamor at the Government, demanding that additional taxes be laid on the great body of our people for their protection, and under the guise of subserving the public good their clamors have been harkened to until the felicity, harmony, and concord that once existed among our people with respect to their respective callings and vocations seem to be almost lost and destroyed.

Sir, in conclusion I would say, let us lay a graduated income tax upon the wealth of the country, and in turn let us lower the tax upon the prime necessities of our people to the lowest point consistent with the raising of a sufficient revenue to pay the current expenses of our Government economically administered. In a word, let us remove the heavy burdens of taxation from the shoulders of those who are least able to bear them, and place them upon the shoulders of those who can and should bear them with becoming fortitude and patriotism. Let us bravely these things do. When we thus shall return good and invaluable service to our constituents who first so graciously put confidence in us we will each win for himself that appellation fit for saints, "Well done, my good and faithful servant." [Loud applause.]

[Mr. SHIVELY withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. PICKLER. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. PERKINS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. HOPKINS reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize the duty on imports, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. POST (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

DEFICIENCIES IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a consolidated and revised statement of the deficiencies forwarded for the action of Congress during the present session, to defray the expenses of the United States courts and of minor appropriations placed under the control of the Attorney-General, to take the place of previous estimates—to the Committee on Appropriations.

TUNNELING DETROIT RIVER.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of a board of engineers on the practicability and approximate cost of tunneling the Detroit River at or near Detroit, Mich., in compliance with the joint resolution of April 19, 1890—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (S. 243) for the relief of Frank Della Terre and Susan F. Della Terre, heirs of Peter Della Terre, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 249) providing for the completion of the public building in the city of Pensacola, Fla., as originally designed—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 298) to increase the accommodations at the Marine Hospital at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 405) for the relief of James A. Terrill—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 460) making an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the construction of a light and fog-signal at the mouth of Coquille River on the Pacific Ocean—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 681) making an appropriation for the benefit of the estate of William Moss, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1028) for the relief of William Bushby—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 1395) to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1456) correcting the military history of David A. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1512) to erect a public building at Lima, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1988) to establish a hospital and home for inebriates and dipsomaniacs in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2200) for the relief of Mary E. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 2695) in relation to a farm for an Indian training school at Pierre, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2741) providing for sundry light-houses and other aids to navigation on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2845) to establish a public park at Pagosa Springs, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2960) to authorize the building of a bridge at Pine Bluff, Ark., across the Arkansas River—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3040) to establish a public park to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3050) to provide for the purchase of a site for a military post near Eagle Pass, Tex., and for the construction of suitable buildings thereon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3115) to punish the unlawful appropriation of the use of the property of another in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 3127) amending an act entitled "An act to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled 'An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, to said port of Lincoln'"—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3174) constituting Cairo, Ill., a port of delivery in the cus-

toms-collection district of New Orleans—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3190) to establish additional life-saving stations—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3191) for the relief of Albert Shell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3192) for the relief of John R. Blankenship—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3498) granting a pension to G. L. Pease—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3545) to extend and amend "An act to authorize the Fort Worth and Denver City Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A joint resolution (S. R. 62) authorizing the Secretary of War to appoint a board of three engineers to examine and report on a national harbor of refuge near the mouth of Delaware Bay suitable for deep-draught vessels—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolutions were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON:

Whereas it is the opinion of a large majority of the people of this country that the working classes should not be employed more than eight hours per day; and

Whereas, also, it is believed that by shortening the hours of labor it would not only give employment to a greater number of people, but by adding time to the hours of leisure and recreation would improve the people, mentally and physically and morally; and

Whereas the uniform eight-hour law is difficult to enforce for reason of diversity of interest, and for the further reason that the manufacturers can not well establish an eight-hour system in their factories unless other manufacturers in their same line of business establish the same rule; and

Whereas it is desirable that Congress should have full information on the subject in order to proceed intelligently, if possible, to bring about as early date as possible an eight-hour law: Therefore

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor are hereby authorized to sit during the vacation of the Fifty-first Congress, and are empowered to send for persons and papers, to employ an assistant sergeant-at-arms, and take evidence in regard to the matters hereinbefore cited, and to report to Congress at the meeting of the second session thereof, by bill or otherwise;

to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SPOONER:

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he hereby is, authorized to appoint an additional Official Reporter of the House, to continue in office until otherwise ordered by the House or the Speaker, during the present Congress, with a salary at the rate of \$5,000 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until other provision shall be made for the payment of the same;

to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

Resolved, That on Saturday, May 10, at the close of the legislative day, the general debate on the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes shall terminate; that on Monday, May 12, at 11 o'clock a. m., the House will proceed, in Committee of the Whole, to consider said bill by paragraphs under the five-minute rule, and that the consideration of said bill shall be continued daily until Monday, May 19, at 4 o'clock p. m., at which time the bill and pending amendments shall be reported to the House;

to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be, and hereby is, authorized and required to investigate and report to this House what means, if any, are practicable to ascertain for the benefit of the agricultural interests of the United States the cause and cure of the disease known generally as the "milk sickness;" and to report further to this House by bill intended to carry into effect such investigation, if such investigation be deemed practicable and desirable;

to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. KETCHAM, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6448) granting leaves of absence to clerks and employés in first, second, and third class post-offices, reported as a substitute therefor, a bill (H. R. 10086) granting leaves of absence to clerks and employés in first and second class post-offices; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANSING, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 8605) to amend the military record of James B. Kirby—to the Committee of the Whole House.

He also, from the same committee, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 8067) to correct the military record of John Ragan—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORROW, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported favorably the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President, if in his opinion not incompatible with the public interests, be requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain and Mexico with a view to securing treaty stipulations with those Governments for the prevention of the entry of Chinese laborers from the Dominion of Canada and Mexico into the United States, contrary to the laws of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEEL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4545) to adjudicate and pay to the Citizen band of Pottawatomie Indians certain claims they have against the United States, reported as a substitute therefor, a bill (H. R. 10098) to adjudicate and pay to the Citizen band of Pottawatomie Indians certain claims they have against the United States; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SIMONDS, from the Committee on War Claims, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 4947) for the relief of the officers and crews of the United States gunboats Kineo and Chocosa—to the Committee of the Whole House.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROWELL: A bill (H. R. 10084) to amend and supplement the election laws of the United States and to provide for the more efficient enforcement of such laws, and for other purposes—to the Select Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 10085) to fix and regulate the duty on sugar of milk—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 10087) to establish the Grant Memorial Home at Mount McGregor, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 10088) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah Cleary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10089) granting a pension to Ellen A. Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10090) to amend the record in the Navy Department of Patrick F. Lynch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN, of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10091) granting correction of muster to Granville J. Vaught—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 10092) for the relief of Sarah J. Vallean, of West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 10093) for the relief of William W. Kerby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio (by request): A bill (H. R. 10094) for the relief of the estate of Abraham Daily—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON, of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10095) to place the name of Ida Button on the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10096) to place the name of May Button on the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10097) for the relief of Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of citizens of Hill County, Texas, asking for the passage of House bill 5353, relating to dealings in options and futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of the Board of Trade of Hillsborough, Tex., against the proposed duty on Mexican ores—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALDERSON: Petition signed by W. L. Swope, president, and C. P. Bradley, secretary, on behalf of the Lindsie Farmers' Alliance, Monroe County, West Virginia, in favor of the passage of Senate bill 2716, appropriating money for the improvement of the harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan: Petition of W. E. Boyden and 17 others, farmers of Webster Township, Washtenaw County, Michigan, in favor of the immediate passage of the McKinley bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas: Protest against the increase of the tariff on breech-loading guns, table cutlery, knives, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest against the increase of the tariff on breech-loading guns, table cutlery, knives, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 42 cigar-makers of Marysville, Kans., against the increase of the tariff on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARNES: Petition of Adelpian Alliance, Burrell County, Georgia, for improvement of Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of I. T. Smith and others, citizens of Columbia and Richmond Counties, Georgia, for the same improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Universal Springs Suballiance, Washington County, Georgia, for the same improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Suballiance No. 1386, Lincoln County, Georgia, for passage of House bill 7162 or Senate bill 2806—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. C. Kennady and others, of same county and State, for the passage of the same measures—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from Union Suballiance, Burke County, Georgia, for improvement of Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLISS: Petition of W. L. Calley and 25 others, citizens of Shaitsburgh, Mich., for the passage of House bill, known as the Conger bill, to prevent lard adulteration—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey: Petition of the watchmen in the United States Government Departments, for an equalization of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCHANAN, of Virginia: Petition of James A. Thompson, of Washington County, Virginia, against increased duty on marble—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James L. Brown, of Abingdon, Va., against increased duty on marble—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON: Protest of the Cleveland Granite Company, against proposed increase of duty on granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHANDLER, of Massachusetts: Petition of railway mail clerks in favor of House bill 6459—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of A. Starkey and others, of Armstrong Alliance, No. 54, Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, of Illinois, for the passage of Butterworth bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COBB (by request): Petition of M. A. Bullard and 99 citizens of Coosa County, Ala., praying for the passage of House bill 7162 or Senate bill 2806—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of F. M. Gaudy and 40 others, of same county and State, for the same measures—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAIG: Memorial of Irwin Post, No. 190, Grand Army of the Republic, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, for service and dependent pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas: Petition of citizens of Goolesborough, Franklin County, Texas, asking for the passage of the subtreasury bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. A. Rowe and others, of Cass County, Texas, for the same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John W. Jakman and others, of Lamar County, Texas, for same bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Eber and others, against the bill forbidding the sale of railroad tickets by other than railroad agents—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of A. P. Sanders, J. H. McClimmens, and others, of Hopkins County, Texas, asking for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of citizens of Delta County, Texas, asking for the passage of the subtreasury bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Arlige, J. N. Duncan, and others, of Fannin County, Texas, for the same bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. S. Grimes and others, of the same county and State, for the same bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARLINGTON: Resolutions of Encampment No. 25, Union Veteran Legion, West Chester, Pa., requesting the passage of the per diem service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMUNDS: Petition for perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition from Eagle Rock, Va., for increase of duty on lime—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., asking for the enlargement of the public building in that city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITCH: Petition of the merchants of the city of New York, protesting against any legislation for the purpose of discriminating against lard compound—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Petition of citizens of the Third Congressional district of New Jersey, for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, in favor of the reopening of the League Island navy-yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois: Petition of Catherine Cain, widow of the late Rev. Charles Cain, and of citizens of Bureau County, Illinois, praying that said Catherine Cain may be allowed and paid for the services of her said husband as chaplain of the Yates Sharpshooters during the late war from the 10th day of December, 1862, until March, 1863, and for a pension for said Catherine Cain as widow of said Charles Cain—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: Protest of Homrich & Lehner, of Galena, Ill., against the increase of duty on granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of George H. Sharland, of Rochelle, Ill., for the same relief—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERR, of Iowa: Petition of 50 citizens of Grundy County, Iowa, in favor of the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KINSEY: Petition favoring passage of House bill 5353, in relation to options and futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: Petition of J. C. Boone and 11 others, from Duplin County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 59 citizens of La Grange, Ind., praying for the passage of laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system under which the interest of depositors is protected by Government supervision—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Petition from 38 members of Condorsport (Pa.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the rejection of the recommendation of the Senate Naval Committee for coast defenses—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of James A. Williams and 50 others, citizens of Bush Creek, Pa., praying for the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Grange No. 821, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Grange No. 817, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Grange No. 84, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Grange 874, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Grange No. 705, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for a duty upon certain agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grange No. 384, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for a duty on certain agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Grange No. 817, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for a duty upon certain agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of District Assembly No. 4, Knights of Labor, in favor of pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Grange No. 912, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, praying for a duty upon certain agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of citizens of Carroll County, Ohio, favoring early passage of the Conger bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of J. W. Higgason and 101 others, citizens of Polk County, Arkansas, in favor of the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MANSUR: Petition of L. B. Osborne and 34 others, citizens of Grundy County, Missouri, for a deep-water harbor on Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of M. E. Frazier and 17 others, citizens of Carroll County, Missouri, praying for the passage of a bill to repeal the special limitation on pension claims of State militiamen disabled in the military service of the United States, and to subject them to the limitations of the general pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of A. W. Walker and 19 others, citizens of the same county and State, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George A. Sprickard and 23 others, citizens of Grundy County, Missouri, for the same measure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. R. Elwood and 36 others, citizens of Linn County, Missouri, praying for the same relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of Warren McCullough and 49 others, of Sullivan County, Missouri, for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana: Protest of Messrs. Holmes Brothers, of Portland, Ind., against the increase of duty on foreign granite used for monumental purposes proposed by the bill (H. R. 9416) known as the McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest from N. A. Myers, of Huntington, Ind., against the same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest from Messrs. Barthemay & Heller, of Bluffton, Ind., against the same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OATES: Petition of Philip King and 54 others, citizens of Coffee and Dale Counties, Alabama, in favor of the passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWEN, of Indiana: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, against liquor-selling at Castle Garden—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of J. O. Johnston and 27 others, residents of Kansas, asking for amendments to the national-banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the Wichita (Kans.) Board of Trade, asking that Mexican lead ore be placed upon the free-list and for a reciprocity treaty with Mexico—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Consolidation Mining Association of Southeastern Kansas and Southwestern Missouri, asking that a duty of 1½ cents per pound on Mexican lead ore be adopted—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of George Crilly, of Castalia, S. Dak., asking legislation in behalf of Des Moines River settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of citizens of San Saba County, Texas, favoring the passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Local Union, No. 367, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, San Antonio, Tex., for limiting work under Government control to eight hours—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCULL: Memorial of Grange No. 790, of Blair County, Pennsylvania, in favor of the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Grange No. 887, of Somerset County, Pennsylvania, in favor of the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of William Carpenter and others, citizens of Rome, N. Y., favoring passage of Mr. Lawler's resolution for short spelling—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SIMONDS: Petition of citizens of Connecticut, against Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of W. F. B. Sawyer and 63 others from Perquimans County, North Carolina, asking passage of bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. F. Howland and 45 others, citizens of Beaufort, N. C., to amend section 4233 Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH, of Illinois: Petition asking relief against Mississippi washouts in Jackson County—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPINOLA: Petition of New York Leaf-Tobacco Board of Trade against Schedule F in McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPOONER: Petition of C. Lippitt and others, citizens of Rhode Island, for laws for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEWART, of Texas: Petition from 178 colored men of Grimes County, Texas, protesting against the passage of the lard-oil bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STIVERS: Protest of J. W. Matthews & Co., J. A. Townsend, W. O. Mailler & Co., and other merchants, against the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of Silas D. Collie, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment of Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, asking for a pension for blindness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of George M. Tubb and others, at Waverly, Tenn., asking passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia: Petition of Isaac R. Mowery and 15 others, of Delray, Hampshire County, West Virginia, in favor of appropriation for Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of S. C. Baker and 18 others, voters of same county and State, for same improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. R. Martin and B. M. Harris, president and secretary of Farmers' Alliance, No. 23, Hampshire County, West Virginia, for the same improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Isaac Von Metre, for estate of Jacob Von Metre, late of Hardy County, West Virginia, praying that his claim for stores and supplies furnished the United States Army during the late civil war

be referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Grange No. 752, of Bradford County, Pennsylvania, asking for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Grange 754, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bradford County, Pennsylvania, asking for certain duties on imported agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Grange 831, of Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, asking protective duties on imported agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 9, 1890.

Prayer by Rev. CHARLES B. RAMSDALL, of Washington City.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from special agents of the Treasury Department at points on the Canadian frontier relative to the evasion of the laws for the exclusion of Chinese laborers.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the letter and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Immigration or the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. SHERMAN. They should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed.

Mr. HALE subsequently said: The papers relating to the subject of immigration which were just now sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations cover a subject that the new Committee on Immigration is now considering. Undoubtedly heretofore, before that committee was created, all matters of that sort naturally went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but a committee to consider the specific subject of immigration, contract labor, and all the things pertaining to the great subject of immigration has taken such papers at this session, I think. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio under those circumstances (I have no feeling about it) whether the work had better be divided.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not object to a reference to the Committee on Immigration if that course has been pursued, but I know a great number of petitions and papers of various kinds in regard to the immigration of Chinese and Chinese laborers have gone to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the whole matter is now in the hands of a subcommittee of that committee. I am perfectly indifferent, however, as to which committee shall take charge of the subject. I think perhaps the papers had better lie on the table for the present.

Mr. HOAR. What is the particular paper?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The indorsement will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of reports from special agents of the Treasury Department at points on the Canadian frontier relative to the evasion of the laws for the exclusion of Chinese laborers."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Similar communications and papers on the same subject have hitherto been referred to the Committee on Immigration, but at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio this was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I should think, from the accounts of that poor and unhappy Chinaman who was last heard of on Niagara bridge, frightening two great nations for fear he should get into either one or the other of them, that the Committee on Coast Defenses would be the proper one. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unless there is some motion to the contrary—

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no preference as to which course is taken. If these papers are referred to the Committee on Immigration I will see that the other papers before the Committee on Foreign Relations are sent to that committee, if that seems to be regarded as the proper committee.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. All the responses, I think, to the resolution which I introduced originally have been referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the order of reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations will be reconsidered and the communication and the accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Immigration and printed. It is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of citizens of Clay Centre, Kans., praying for an amendment to the interstate-commerce law, relating to the sale of liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Col. D. M. Jones Post, No. 172, Grand Army of the Republic, of Tyrone, Pa., praying for the passage of the dependent-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Argentine, Kans., praying for the admission of Mexican ores into the United States free of duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented a petition of 12 citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying for the passage of a bill granting a pension to Sanford Kirkpatrick; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a communication from William D. Warner, consul of the United States at Cologne, Germany, in regard to an appropriation for clerk-hire at that consulate, accompanied by a communication from F. O. St. Clair, chief of the Consular Bureau. I move the reference of these papers to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. I also present a petition signed by a number of colored people of Williamsburgh County, South Carolina, praying for an appropriation to enable them to emigrate to Africa, which is accompanied by an indorsement of a number of colored and white people as to the respectability and character of the petitioners. I move that the petition lie on the table, as the bill to which it relates has not yet been referred.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present resolutions adopted by the Johnson County Farmers and Laborers' Union in regard to the stringency in money and the much consequent distress, reciting that the United States Government is alone authorized to make money which shall be a legal tender, whether it be by stamp upon paper, silver, or gold, and that the value of the three commodities, when used as money, depends entirely upon the stamp of the Government making it a legal tender; that the money advanced by the Government upon its own bonds to the holders thereof has furnished a good and acceptable currency through which most of the exchanges are made; and that the present stringency is due to the continued contraction of money in circulation from about \$52 per capita in 1866 to about \$6 at the present time; that it is of very great consequence to national and individual interests that credit should be established, where merited, as far as is safe and practicable; that the Government can do this without any risk to itself, upon much of the property of the country, as it is now doing upon its own bonds, upon which it is paying interest, and that loans upon a property basis would furnish all the money needed, without cost to the Government, and a fair interest paid by the borrowers would give to the Government for the use of its credits in bills a large income; and therefore resolving in favor of the passage of a law enabling farmers and others holding real estate to borrow money of the Government, secured by farm and real-estate mortgages to half their cash value, at 1 per cent. interest per annum, for twenty years, the same as national banks now borrow money of the Government.

I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of William Ulrich and 100 others, citizens of the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of House bill 5353, in relation to dealing in options and futures; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Heman A. Brown, in behalf of the committee of ex-Union prisoners of war, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the Morrill pension bill, and also against the disregard of the appeals of ex-Union prisoners of war for relief for sufferings and other wrongs; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR presented the petition of Rev. J. Lackey and 27 others, citizens of Guernsey, Iowa, and the petition of the First Presbytery of Ohio, officially signed, praying for the reconsideration and passage of the Blair educational bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HIGGINS presented a resolution of Capital Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Dover, Del., in favor of the free coinage of silver; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the passage of a law to prohibit the sale of liquors at places of landing of immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a memorial of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., praying the adoption of the specific and ad valorem duties upon cotton hosiery fixed in the pending McKinley tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9041) to increase the pension of William Hamill, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3302) for the relief of Charles W. Geddes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER. I am instructed by the Committee on Claims to