

except our own. We have no orders in society, no standing armies, no traditions to which we may cling, no great vested interest, no class to lead us. There was a disruption in the South in which everything went down into a chasm and beyond recall.

By an interposition of Divine Providence a revolution was wrought at the very moment when we were put at the greatest stress of fortune; and will not the people of the North, the generous and patriotic men and women of the North, who have come to our aid with such abundant benevolence in our many trials, be persuaded that the good men and good women of the South are striving not for party conquest, not for any base and ignoble purposes, but that they are endeavoring to do all they can according to their means to solve rightly every problem which God Almighty has committed to them, to do what they can to free society from the dangers of ignorance and vice and strife?

But they will never cease as long as they cherish liberty to feel that they ought to make any sacrifices to prevent this great instrument of government from falling into the hands of a race marked as distinct from the white race, and which has not yet the capacity because perhaps it has not had the opportunity to fit itself for the responsibilities of self-government.

We united with Senators from the North to exclude the Chinese from our country because they were regarded as an element dangerous to our society, and we have read in Froude's account of the West India Islands of the deplorable and blighting results of negro supremacy.

Sir, I do not mean at this time to suggest that we should take the ballot away from the negroes. I trust the experiment of universal suffrage in the South may prove successful. But we owe it to ourselves and to them to exhaust all the resources of civilization, using a phrase of Mr. Gladstone, to dissuade them from casting their ballots in favor of men incapable of administering the government, and from banding together in secret orders, under unscrupulous and designing men, to make war upon all the institutions we have inherited from our ancestors.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before submitting the motion, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 1, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask by unanimous consent that the reading of that portion of the Journal relating to the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions be dispensed with.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The residue of the Journal was read.

CORRECTION.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to correct the Journal. I introduced yesterday a bill to abolish war taxes upon American shipping. Upon examination I do not find that bill noticed in the Journal, and I would like to have the proper correction made. The mistake has arisen from confusing two bills—one introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], and the other by myself.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read that part of the Journal.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 9738) providing for the organization of the Commission on Fish and Fisheries, and defining its duties; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas. Mine was a bill to abolish war taxes on American shipping; and it does not appear in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the correction to be made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Now, I desire to have the RECORD corrected. It follows the Journal, as those bills were filed at the Clerk's desk. On page 3672 it is stated that the bill (H. R. 9738) providing for the organization of the commission on fish and fisheries and defining its duties, was introduced by myself. That is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas. My bill, which the House gave consent should be printed in the RECORD, is not noticed. I desire that the RECORD should be corrected, so that my bill may appear as introduced and may

be published in full, in accordance with the leave granted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The necessary correction will be made. The Chair will cause the Journal to be corrected according to the gentleman's statement.

The bill introduced by Mr. BUCHANAN, a bill (H. R. 9739) to abolish war taxes upon American shipping, was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, ordered to be printed, and also to be published in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved May 31, 1880, entitled "An act to repeal the tonnage duties upon ships and vessels of the United States and upon certain foreign vessels," which was repealed by section 15 of the act approved July 14, 1862, entitled "An act increasing temporarily the duties on imports, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, re-enacted as follows:

"That from and after the passage of this act no duties upon the tonnage of the ships and vessels of the United States, of which the officers and two-thirds of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, shall be levied or collected; and all acts or parts of acts imposing duties upon the tonnage of ships and vessels of the United States, officered and manned as aforesaid, so far as the same relate to the imposition of such duties, shall, from and after said 1st day of April next, be repealed."

"SEC. 2. That from and after the said 1st day of April next all acts and parts of acts imposing duties upon the tonnage of the ships and vessels of any foreign nation, so far as the same relate to the imposition of such duties, shall be repealed: Provided, That the President of the United States shall be satisfied that the discriminating or countervailing duties of such foreign vessels, so far as they operate to the disadvantage of the United States, have been abolished."

EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONGRESS.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of expenditures of the appropriation for entertaining and providing for expenses of the Ninth International Medical Congress, September, 1887; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

REPAIR OF SEA-WALL, NAVAL HOSPITAL, NORFOLK, VA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Navy of an appropriation to be immediately available for repair of the seawall at the naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FIRE-ESCAPES, HOWARD UNIVERSITY BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Interior for the erection of fire-escapes upon the Howard University building; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions requesting that the sum of \$3,500,000 be transferred from the appropriations for Mexican war pensions to the Army pension appropriations; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

UNION BANK OF AUSTRALIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, with accompanying papers, and a letter from the Secretary of State, relative to the relief of the Union Bank of Australia, limited, for losses sustained through payment of certain drafts drawn by the late United States commercial agent at Levuka, Fiji Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REFERENCE OF BILLS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, under the rule, Senate bills, which were severally read a first and second time, and referred as follows, namely:

The bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building at Youngstown, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 349) for the erection of a public building at Akron, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation of Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2329) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to re-examine and reaudit a claim of the State of Pennsylvania for advances made and money borrowed by said State to pay the militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 68) for the relief of James H. Smith, late postmaster at Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

RETURN OF BILL TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will also lay before the House a request of the Senate for the return of a bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, April 30, 1888.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection this request will be complied with, and the Clerk will be directed to return the bill to the Senate.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHITE, of Indiana, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 1788) for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Pa.

KANSAS CITY AND PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Indian Affairs the bill (S. 1148) to grant a right of way to the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad Company through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, and ask its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. The bill, Mr. Speaker, is quite a lengthy one, and if there is to be an objection to its present consideration, perhaps it should be interposed now, so as to save the time that would be necessarily occupied in reading the bill.

Mr. MILLS. What is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. To grant a right of way through the Indian Territory to this railroad company.

Mr. DOCKERY. I trust the gentleman will not object. It is a measure of great importance to our people.

Mr. PERKINS. I will say that I have received a large number of petitions asking for the immediate consideration of this bill, and also from the Board of Trade of the city of Kansas City, Mo., and numerous other cities and towns in Kansas. It is quite important that immediate action should be taken upon the bill.

Mr. MILLS. I think we had better not delay the consideration of the regular order.

Mr. DOCKERY. I sincerely hope that there will be no objection to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MILLS. How long will it take to get through with it?

Mr. PERKINS. There will be no debate, I take it. The bill is carefully prepared and contains all the safeguards usual to such legislation.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLS. If it will not consume much time in its consideration, I will not make any special objection.

Mr. PERKINS. It contains every provision and every safeguard that has been incorporated in bills of this character heretofore and which have received the favorable consideration of this House in the past. This bill has received the consideration of our committee and now comes before the House with its unanimous indorsement. It is recommended unanimously by the committee.

Mr. MILLS. Can we dispense with the reading of the bill?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let the gentleman simply state the object of it, and let the reading be dispensed with.

Mr. PERKINS. The object of the bill is to grant to the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory for their road from Kansas into Texas. I repeat, it has every safeguard which has been incorporated in this character of bills for the protection of the Indians, and all the rights of the Government under it are preserved.

Mr. ROGERS. Ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill, and put it upon its passage.

Mr. PERKINS. I was just about to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. The company for which I speak is a responsible one, and now has more than a hundred miles of road in operation and desires to extend its road from Kansas City to the Gulf and give to the people of Missouri, Kansas, and Texas another competing line through the Indian Territory, and also another line binding together and connecting more closely these great States of the West and South.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Kansas whether the usual limitations as to the transportation of passengers, etc., are in the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Every one, and in addition there is a clause not heretofore incorporated in such bills which provides that Indians who are not satisfied with the award of damages in condemnation proceedings may appeal to the courts, and although they may not recover in court as much as is given by the commissioners, still they are to recover costs, notwithstanding such appeal and reduction in damages awarded.

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

There was no objection.

The reading of the bill in full was dispensed with.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS EASTERN BRANCH.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 2458) to amend an act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to make such alterations in the plan of said bridge as will best accommodate the traffic over and under said bridge, and for said purpose the sum of \$60,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided,* That the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company pay their fair and just proportion of the cost of said alteration at the west end of said bridge, to be determined by the Secretary of War.

The Committee on the District of Columbia recommended the following amendment:

In lines 4 and 5 strike out the words "said bridge" and insert "the bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east."

Mr. MILLS. Does the bill make any appropriation?

Mr. HEMPHILL. The bill makes an appropriation of \$60,000. The House will remember that last year we made an appropriation for a bridge over the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River. We appropriated a sum of money which at that time was thought to be sufficient. The Secretary of War has let out contracts under that act; but now it has become perfectly apparent that the sum appropriated is not sufficient to give the people there the bridge they want. In addition to that the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, by reason of the extension of the track which they are entitled to under the law, have a title to the land upon which this bridge as now planned will land; so that the public in crossing the bridge will run against the railroad. It is necessary to extend the bridge far enough over to allow the railroad to run under it. The Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company have the right of way of, I think, 60 feet on each side of its track, and as the bridge is now planned people in crossing it will run right into the railroad track. This bill proposes to give additional money to build a better bridge, so that people in crossing the bridge may go over the railroad track instead of running right into it.

The bill has passed the Senate, and has been unanimously reported by the House committee after a personal investigation by some of the members, if I recollect correctly.

It is provided that the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company shall pay their just proportion of the increased cost, and that the amount of their share shall be determined by the Secretary of War.

The reason why I ask unanimous consent of the House to pass the bill at this time is because I have a letter from the Secretary of War, received yesterday, stating that the construction of the bridge according to the present plan is now going on, and that it will cost from \$500 to \$1,000 each day if there is delay in changing the plan.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much is appropriated out of the public Treasury for the bridge, including the appropriation made by this bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. The original appropriation, I think, was \$125,000. This will make the total amount \$185,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the District provide half the cost?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. What provision does the bill make about that?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Let the Clerk read the bill again.

The bill was again read.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not observe any such provision in the bill.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I will add a proviso to the effect that one-half of the appropriation shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the proposed amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the bill the following:

"*Provided further,* That one-half of the sum hereby appropriated shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

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

There was no objection.

The question being put on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee and the amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL, they were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HEMPHILL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill

was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ABOLITION OF PUBLIC DRUNKENNESS.

Mr. ATKINSON, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 9769) to punish public drunkenness in the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

The SPEAKER. That requires a vote of two-thirds.

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

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may file them at the desk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

There was no objection, and the following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

GEORGE CAMPBELL.

Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6018) for the relief of George Campbell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MICHIGAN CAVALRY.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3393) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1867, and for other purposes," approved July 28, 1866; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

D. W. BOUTWELL.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2253) for the relief of D. W. Boutwell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DETAIL OF ARMY OFFICERS TO COLLEGES, ETC.

Mr. SENEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6661) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS OF VOLUNTEER OFFICERS.

Mr. CUTCHEON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 144) to provide for the adjudication of claims of volunteer officers under the acts of June 3, 1864, and February 3, 1867; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR STORES AND SUPPLIES.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 9770) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army as reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HUDSON G. LAMKIN.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of Hudson G. Lamkin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS ENGLISH.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8692) for the relief of Thomas English; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SCREW STEEL STEAMER SCYTHIAN.

Mr. DUNN, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9081) to authorize an American register to be issued for the screw steel steamer Scythian; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, OTTUMWA, IOWA.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back the bill (H. R. 8031) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ottumwa, Iowa, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported in the nature of a substitute a bill (H. R. 9771) for the erection of a public building at Ottumwa, Iowa; which was read a first and second time, referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EMANUEL H. CUSTER.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9387) for the relief of Emanuel H. Custer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN A. ROLF.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7093) granting an increase of pension to John A. Rolf; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARETHA SUSSMAN.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 3901) for the relief of Margaretha Sussman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. ADELINE COUZINS.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2356) to provide a pension for Mrs. Adeline Couzins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

J. W. McMILLAN.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1074) for the relief of J. W. McMillan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NEIL FISHER.

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 105) for the relief of Neil Fisher; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TENEDORE TEN EYCK.

Mr. LAIRD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5569) to authorize the President to restore Tenedore Ten Eyck to his former rank in the Army, and to place him upon the retired-list of Army officers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM R. MURPHEY.

Mr. GEAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9579) for the relief of William R. Murphey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ROBERT TRAVILA.

Mr. STOCKDALE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3618) for the relief of Robert Travila for amount overcharged for loss of carbine; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WINNEBAGO RESERVATION, NEBRASKA.

Mr. MCSHANE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8372) authorizing the sale of a portion of the Winnebago reservation in Nebraska; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

UMATILLA RESERVATION, OREGON.

Mr. MCSHANE also, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 970) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an allotment of lands in severalty to the Indians residing upon the Umatilla reservation, in the State of Oregon, and granting patents therefor, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1885; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CHESTER, PA.

Mr. SOWDEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back the bill (H. R. 1785) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9772) for the erection of a public building at Chester, Pa.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ROANOKE, VA.

Mr. SOWDEN also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1294) for the erection of

a public building at the city of Roanoke, Roanoke County, Virginia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9197) granting an increase of pension to George S. Hawley; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

LOUISE F. D. HOIT.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9587) granting a pension to Louise F. D. Hoyt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM C. LORD.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7202) granting a pension to William C. Lord; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN S. BRYANT.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5155) granting a pension to John S. Bryant; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOUISE PROVOST.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 1884) granting a pension to Louise Provost; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CONVICT LABOR.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, from the Committee on Labor, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 8716) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the sale of the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

INTERNAL-REVENUE LAW.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to present at this time, that it may be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and printed in the RECORD, a petition, very numerously signed by well-known business men of the city of Philadelphia, relative to a repeal of a portion of the internal-revenue tax, especially that upon alcohol wherever it enters into the making of medicines, so that medicines can be sold cheaper. I ask that the petition be read.

Objection was made to the reading.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Then I will put it in the box, and hope the Committee on Ways and Means will read it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the petition be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that it be printed in the RECORD without the names.

The petition is as follows:

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

The undersigned, citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, respectfully petition your honorable bodies to repeal that portion of the internal revenue law which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and requires them to take out a license and pay annually the sum of \$25 therefor; and your petitioners further pray that as alcohol enters largely into the manufacture of medicines, thereby increasing their cost to the sick and needy, and as the necessities of the Government no longer require this excessive tax upon an article so largely used in the arts and medicine, that your honorable bodies take such action as will reduce the tax on spirits.

TARIFF.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted to-day by a large and increasing surplus of money in our Treasury, while our people are overburdened with unjust and unnecessary taxes. One of the cardinal principles of good government is that no more money should be collected by taxation than is necessary to pay the expenses of the government, economically administered. President Jackson emphasized this prin-

ciple in his last annual message to the Congress of the United States by saying:

The safest and simplest mode of obviating all the difficulties which have been mentioned is to collect only revenue enough to meet the wants of the Government, and let the people keep the balance of their property in their hands to be used for their own profit.

A GREAT QUESTION.

One of the great questions before us is, what causes this surplus, which amounts to nearly a hundred millions of dollars per annum, and which in a few years, if nothing is done, will draw all the money into the Treasury and produce stagnation of business, destruction of value, and financial ruin throughout the country? There can be but one answer to this question, and that is, excessive taxation and unjust exaction produce the surplus. Under our system of government every citizen is guaranteed the full enjoyment of the efforts of his industry and strength, subject only to such deductions as may be his share in maintaining the Government. The collection of more than this is unjust extortion and legalized robbery. The history of the world shows fearful and wonderful results growing out of high taxes and unjust exactions. For these causes Charles the First was beheaded and the last of the Stuarts was driven into exile. For these causes our war for independence was fought and our Government established on the doctrine of proper taxation and fair representation; but—

Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war.

The time has come when private extortion must yield to public right and selfish interest give way to public good, and excessive taxation must be remedied by a fair and conservative reduction of the taxes, and a diminution of the surplus will follow.

PRESIDENTS AND PARTIES HAVE RECOMMENDED TAX REFORM.

Both the great national parties have declared in favor of a tariff reduction. The Republican party at the national convention held at Chicago in 1884 promised to correct the inequalities of the tariff. The Democratic party at the national conventions held at St. Louis in 1876, at Cincinnati in 1880, and at Chicago in 1884, declared in favor of a revision of the tariff in a spirit of fairness for all interests.

In 1883 a Republican Congress provided for the appointment of a "tariff commission," which was composed mainly of men interested in protected industries; but the necessity and wisdom of tariff reduction were so great that the commissioners reported in favor of a reduction of from 20 to 25 per cent.

President Arthur said in his first message to Congress:

It seems to me that the time has arrived when the people may justly demand some relief from their present onerous burdens.

In his second annual message to Congress he said:

I heartily approve the Secretary's recommendation of immediate and extensive reductions in the annual revenues of the Government.

President Cleveland made himself conspicuous before the world for wisdom, patriotism, and courage by devoting his entire annual message to the Fiftieth Congress to the discussion and recommendation of surplus reduction and tax reform. In the light of these expressions it seems to me that Congress should have long ago provided for a diminution of tariff rates.

The Journals of the House of Representatives, however, show that when we on this side of the House have brought in bills to reduce taxes on the necessities of life those on the other side have mustered nearly their entire strength to defeat us.

In 1884 and 1885 they struck out the enacting clause of our bills to reduce taxes, and in 1886 and 1887 they voted almost unanimously in opposition to even considering the bill to reduce taxation; but the continued flow of money into the United States Treasury at the rate of \$42,000 per hour, and the manifest injustice and impolicy of maintaining a revenue system which compels the people to pay annually millions of dollars more than is needed by the Government, and the demands of those who have to bear the burdens and endure the hardships of onerous taxation are beginning to be heeded, and "A bill to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue" is at last being considered in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. MCKINLEY. As we were in a minority, of course we could not have prevented the consideration of that bill without the help of Democrats on your side of the House.

Mr. MCCREARY. If it had not been for the Republicans on your side of the House we would have prevented the enacting clause from being stricken out of the first bill and we would have considered the last bill, which was known as the Morrison bill.

Mr. MCKINLEY. You mean that if it had not been for some Democrats on your own side of the House you would have succeeded.

Mr. MCCREARY. The revenues of the Government are derived mainly from internal taxation and from tariff duties. The receipts from internal revenue for the fiscal year of 1887 amounted to \$118,823,391.22; the receipts from tariff duties amounted to \$217,286,893.13, and from miscellaneous sources, \$35,292,993.31, amounting in all to \$371,403,277.66. The total expenditure of the Government for 1887 amounted to \$315,835,428.12

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAX.

The internal revenue is derived mainly from the taxes on distilled spirits, malt liquors, and tobacco, and the amount collected from this source goes directly into the Treasury, less about 3 per cent., the cost of collection. This tax is imposed on luxuries, and the amount collected is a clear gain to the Treasury. It does not interfere with nor add to the cost of clothing, food, shelter, farming implements, or any necessary of life, but helps to relieve them of the burdens of taxation.

TARIFF TAX.

The tariff tax is imposed on foreign articles imported into this country. It is first paid by the importer, but ultimately comes out of the consumer. When levied and collected for the Government, it is a revenue tariff; when it is levied for the purpose of aiding individuals in their business or private enterprises, it is a protective tariff.

The average tariff rate in 1850 was 27 per cent., in 1857 it had been reduced to a little over 18 per cent., but it was raised to an average rate of 40.29 per cent. on dutiable goods between the years 1862 and 1866 inclusive—the venerable and distinguished father of the bill then introduced declaring—

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

His utterances have not been fulfilled. Although more than twenty years have passed since the war closed, these war taxes still remain, and they are heavier to-day than they were on an average during the late war, the average tariff duty now being 47.10 per cent.

WAR TAXES THAT HAVE BEEN REPEALED.

As peaceful and prosperous years have rolled by, many taxes caused by the necessities of the war have been repealed.

The income tax, which brought to the United States Treasury in 1866 \$72,000,000; the tax imposed on home manufactures, which brought in \$127,000,000 in that same year, were soon repealed after the war. They reached a high and select class of manufacturers and moneyed men, and they were soon blotted out.

There were also taxes on bank deposits, bank checks, taxes on the receipts of railroad companies, on insurance companies, and on express companies. These also yielded to the magic wand, waved by the rich and powerful, and vanished from our statute-books. Even the taxes on whisky and tobacco were much reduced, and the tax on playing cards was removed, but the tariff tax, which is so burdensome and crushing to the moneyless man and the laboring man, stands before the world as the only tax in our "land of the free and home of the brave" whose average rate has been increased since the war.

MANUFACTURERS GET MOST OF THE MONEY.

The tariff brings more money to the manufacturer than to the Treasury. The aggregate value of the manufactured products of the United States is reported by the Bureau of Statistics to be worth, in round numbers, \$6,000,000,000 annually. More than two-thirds, or four billions, are sold in this country. The increased cost to the consumer in consequence of the tariff duties is, according to the estimates made by Professor Arthur L. Perry, \$869,159,572 per annum, which goes into the pockets of manufacturers and private persons, outside of the amount received in the Treasury on imports.

Therefore the tariff tax, which put \$217,000,000 into the Treasury last year, put \$869,159,572 into the pockets of manufacturers and private persons, being \$4 into their pockets for every dollar put into the Treasury. When we reduce the tariff we not only provide for a reduction of a continually increasing surplus, but for every dollar we leave out of the Treasury we leave \$4 in the pockets of the people.

THE PROBLEM.

The problem then to be solved is, what shall we do with the surplus and the tariff; shall we get rid of the surplus by extravagant expenditures and leave the tariff high, or shall we reduce taxation, and thereby reduce the surplus?

We have more money piled up in the United States Treasury than there is in the Treasury of any kingdom, monarchy, or empire under the sun. Indeed, we have a greater amount thus hoarded than have the three leading nations of Europe.

A large surplus is a perpetual menace to an economical government, and invites unwise legislation, jobs and rings, and a long train of evils. It should be avoided.

If we reduce taxation, shall it be done by reducing the tariff taxes or by reducing the internal-revenue taxes?

If I consulted my own wishes I would say the reduction of tariff taxes is the true course. They rest on the necessities of life and on nearly everything by which industry is benefited or civilization advanced.

The internal-revenue tax is obtained from luxuries. The taxes on them are in the nature of voluntary taxes, for any person who is burdened with them may cease to use the articles and avoid the tax.

To me it seems preposterous to suggest that whisky, beer, and tobacco be made free and the necessities of life bear the burdens of taxation. No civilized country on earth ever did this. I can never vote for free whisky, free tobacco, and free beer, until we have free food, free clothing, free fuel, free implements of labor, and last, but not least, free blankets and free Bibles.

WHO WANTS FREE WHISKY AND FREE TOBACCO?

Whence comes the demand for free whisky and free tobacco? There are no delegations of distillers or tobacco raisers here to ask the repeal of internal revenue taxes. No petitions have been sent here that I have heard of by whisky makers or whisky sellers or whisky drinkers. Neither have the tobacco producers or the chewers or the smokers sent in their petitions. The great, zealous, importunate demand for free whisky, free tobacco, and free beer comes from the advocates of that masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense, known as "high protective tariff," and from the manufacturers and monopolists who have fattened on the hard earnings of the people and who are making colossal fortunes by means of the tax imposed on the necessities of life.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], the venerable god-father of the existing tariff, does not agree with me. He declared as far back as the 12th day of December, 1870, in this Hall, but his party overruled him, that the true principle of revenue reform points to the abolition of the internal-revenue system, and he reiterated that statement in his recent speech against the pending bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman pardon a moment's interruption?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. I believe the resolution to which the gentleman refers was adopted with but six dissenting votes in the House. It is, therefore, a mistake for him to say that my party overruled me on that resolution; there were but six votes against me.

Mr. MCCREARY. Was not the other branch of Congress Republican at that time?

Mr. KELLEY. The resolution did not go to the other House.

Mr. MCCREARY. Was there not a caucus of the Republicans here which overruled the gentlemen?

Mr. KELLEY. You are referring now to the Forty-seventh Congress, when I had the honor of being chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MCCREARY. Was there not a caucus of your party in the Forty-seventh Congress in relation to your internal-revenue resolution?

Mr. KELLEY. You have recited a resolution that I offered in 1870—eighteen years ago.

Mr. MCCREARY. Was there not a caucus held relative to the resolution which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] introduced, urging that the internal-revenue taxes be repealed, and did not that caucus refuse to indorse that resolution?

Mr. KELLEY. Not the resolution to which the gentleman refers in his speech.

Mr. MCCREARY. I am asking the gentleman this question: Was there a Republican caucus held here at any time in reference to the gentleman's resolution, and was he not compelled by that Republican caucus to give up his views in favor of repealing internal-revenue taxes? I ask the gentleman to answer that question, yes or no.

Mr. KELLEY. I mean to answer the question, and I know that so courteous a gentleman as the gentleman from Kentucky does not wish to make a misstatement.

Mr. MCCREARY. Oh, no.

Mr. KELLEY. You have cited a resolution that I submitted to Congress in 1870, and as to which there were but six dissenting votes, although you have said that my party overruled me. When I deny that, and say that six votes did not overrule the whole House, you now refer to an incident which occurred in the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress, four years ago, when I proposed to repeal internal taxes, to wit, the taxes on tobacco and on malt liquors, and my party did, in caucus, although I was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, refuse to hear either my argument or my figures. That is so.

Mr. MCCREARY. As the Republicans were in power for twenty years and had authority and power during that time to repeal the internal-revenue taxes, why did they not do it?

Mr. KELLEY. Why? Because they needed the money; having had a Southern rebellion to suppress. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCCREARY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania's views are carried out and the entire internal-revenue taxes are repealed, as he proposes in his speech, there will be a deficit of \$60,000,000 per annum in the revenues of the Government.

Mr. KERR. Would it not take four years of that deficit to overcome that surplus?

Mr. MCCREARY. Oh, no, sir; it would not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Oh, yes; it would.

Mr. MCCREARY. He said also that "the enactment of this bill would instantly paralyze the enterprise and energy of the people." This is his view of a measure, the purpose of which is to relieve an overflowing Treasury and reduce taxation. This is his criticism of a bill, the object of which is to lessen the taxes which a comparatively small number of men can impose on millions of their fellow-men to build up the industries of one State at the expense of the people of a large part of the country. This is his opinion of a bill which, if it becomes a law, will still leave the average tariff rate in our Republic higher than it is in any other country in the world. I say to the distinguished gentleman that the assertion he has made can not be maintained, and that

the people will require further explanation before they will believe that a conservative reduction of a war tariff and a gradual return of a hoarded surplus to those from whom it was unjustly taken will retard or paralyze the enterprise of the people or the prosperity of the country.

DEFENSE OF KENTUCKY.

He is mistaken in this, as he is mistaken in many of the statements made in the same speech about Kentucky.

I remember well that in the early autumn of last year, when our fields and pastures had reached their rich perfection, while the people were resting after an abundant harvest, and the genial climate and the sunny days suggested hospitality and social meetings, I noticed in the papers that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania had arrived by invitation at Louisville, Ky., to address an industrial convention. I noticed also with pleasure that after remaining at Louisville a few days he was escorted to the State capital, and then to Lexington, the center of the blue-grass region, and to other cities. We were all glad that the distinguished statesman from Pennsylvania had time and was willing to be our guest, for we love to welcome our brothers from the North as well as from the South to our State, believing that if "we know each other better we will love each other more."

The distinguished gentleman's speech in this Hall, I regret to say, indicates that he arrived at many erroneous conclusions while in Kentucky, and that he did not study that State as closely as he has studied the tariff.

When he called Kentucky a "laggard," why did he not compare Kentucky with Vermont, the first-born of the United States, and the only State which came into the Union before Kentucky, where protection has always flourished like a green bay tree, where it has had its stronghold for more than half a century, where the father of the existing tariff law has been elected term after term to the Senate of the United States? Vermont, the eldest daughter of our Republic, always steadfast and true to a protective tariff, has a population of 332,286, and only two Representatives in Congress. Kentucky has a population of 1,648,090, and has eleven Representatives in Congress, yet the gentleman singled Kentucky out as a laggard, and said not one word about Vermont.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] said of Kentucky:

The mass of her people are steeped in poverty and illiteracy. In 1880 the number of her people above ten years of age, who were reported by the census as unable to read and write, was more than one-half her total population. That number was 606,578, while her total population, which of course included those under ten years of age, numbered 1,163,498.

This is a marvelous misrepresentation.

According to the census of 1880, Kentucky had a population of 1,642,000, instead of 1,166,498, as stated by him. The census report also shows that the percentage of illiteracy in Kentucky is less than in any other of the Southern States, except Texas and West Virginia; and instead of there being 606,578 persons, or one-half of her whole population, as he states, who can not read and write, there are but 258,186 persons above ten years of age who can not read and write, out of her entire population.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. I was speaking, from census figures, of the proportion of illiteracy among the people over ten years of age. I said elsewhere that Kentucky had a population of more than 1,600,000, but that when you abstracted from that total the children under ten years of age, you were left with a total, as I stated it, of one million and one hundred and odd thousand, and that was the total with which I was dealing.

Now, as the gentleman has permitted me, I am ready to say that I may have fallen into error in assuming that the total of persons unable to read was distinct from the total of those who were unable to write, while it is possible that the latter number included the former; which would make a change in my figures but would leave the general elements of the statement as they are.

I have in my desk the papers upon which I based my statements.

Mr. MCCREARY. I will read from the gentleman's speech which I hold in my hand, the corrected copy which he has printed and sent out to the country:

Speaking of Kentucky he said the mass of her people—

are steeped in poverty and illiteracy. In 1880 the number of her people above ten years of age who were reported by the census as unable to read and write were one-half of her total population. The number was 606,578, while her total population—

Which of course includes those under ten years of age—numbered 1,163,498.

That speech does not agree with what the gentleman says to-day. Mr. Chairman, according to the census of 1880 Kentucky had a population of 1,642,000, instead of 1,163,498 as stated by the gentleman. He merely made, as regards Kentucky, a mistake of half a million, or one-third of her population.

Mr. KELLEY. I stated her population at 1,600,000, but her population within school age at 1,100,000.

Mr. MCCREARY. I have here the remarks of the gentleman as printed and sent out by him.

The census report also shows that the percentage of illiteracy in Kentucky is less than in any other of the Southern States except Texas and West Virginia, and instead of there being 606,573 persons, or one-half of her whole population, as he states, who can not read and write, there are but 258,186 persons above ten years of age who can not read and write, out of her entire population, and when we subtract colored persons—

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman is mistaken. There are more than 348,000 who can not write.

Mr. MCCREARY. I said "read and write."

Mr. KELLEY. There are 348,392 who can not write.

Mr. MCCREARY. The gentleman makes the mistake now, as he did before, of adding together those who can not read and those who can not write.

Mr. KELLEY. Those are the illiterates; and they number, as I have said, more than 348,000.

Mr. MCCREARY. I wish to be understood, Mr. Chairman, on this point, because I make a comparison with Pennsylvania to which I invite the attention of the gentleman. When we subtract colored persons in Kentucky over ten years of age who can not read, to wit, 133,895, there are but 124,219 white persons over ten years of age who can not read and write in that State, while there are 128,105 white persons who can not read and write in Pennsylvania. Thus it appears that there are more white persons who are illiterates in Pennsylvania than in Kentucky. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. I ask the gentleman whether the colored people are not part of the population of Kentucky?

Mr. MCCREARY. They are; and are they not a part of the population of Pennsylvania?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; but why do you exclude them when you enumerate the illiterates?

Mr. MCCREARY. I subtract them in Pennsylvania and I subtract them in Kentucky.

Mr. KELLEY. The native white population of Kentucky who can not read and write are more numerous than in any other State.

Mr. MCCREARY. I have stated that there is less illiteracy in Kentucky than in any of the Southern States except Texas and West Virginia, and the census report shows this.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

The mass of her people are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life but to the commonest and most absolute daily necessities of Northern laborers.

This is a gross misrepresentation, for there is not a State in the Union where the laboring classes are better clothed, fed, and housed than in Kentucky, and this is the reputation of Kentucky with every person I have ever heard except the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I quoted a statement made to the convention which I was invited to address, by one of its committee. I knew nothing of the subject; but it was so reported to the convention.

Mr. MCCREARY. I have the published proceedings of that convention. The gentleman may have heard privately some such statement, but no such statement was ever sent out to the public.

Mr. KELLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it was.

Mr. MCCREARY. Then I say further, Mr. Chairman, that on this important subject the gentleman from Pennsylvania ought not to have made that assertion unless he had examined the facts and found out for himself that it was the truth. [Applause.]

In his zeal to assail Kentucky, why does he forget his own city, Philadelphia, and his own State, Pennsylvania.

I call him as a witness to testify about his protection-ridden city. In his speech in the House of Representatives, May 8, 1879, he said:

Why, sir, the people of my city, Philadelphia, the working people, whose pride it has been to have their families under their own roof, are many of them huddling together, three or four families in one such house, and then are probably unable to pay their rent.

No such poverty and huddling as he testifies to in his own city can be found in any part of Kentucky.

I have not time now to read the evidence as published by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education in regard to the condition and wretchedness of laboring men in the coal and iron region of Pennsylvania, but I commend it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The testimony shows that the wages and earnings of laborers in the coal and iron region of Pennsylvania are not sufficient to give them comforts or even a decent support for their families, and that there has been a steady degradation in the condition of laboring men in Pennsylvania during the last twenty years.

Mr. Chairman, I will now read an extract from a speech made by a former member of this House in 1884, who is now the distinguished and honored mayor of New York City, Hon. Abram S. Hewitt:

I have been in the coal regions of this country within the last six months, and have seen with my own eyes a condition of things which made my heart sad, which made me hope that this Congress might be wise enough to remove some of the causes of the wretchedness and the misery which I saw there. When I saw that men who worked a whole day away from the light of heaven, and who took their lives in their hands every time they entered the pit, are housed in hovels such as the lordly owners of the mines would refuse to stable their cattle in, then I felt that something was wrong in the condition of the American laborer.

When I learn that there are miners of iron ore working in the State of Pennsylvania for 75 cents a day, then I know that there is something wrong in the legislation of this country, for the duty upon iron ore was put up by the last tariff act on an average from 40 or 45 cents a ton to 75 cents a ton in order to protect these very miners and to give them high wages. When that act was passed they were in receipt of \$1.25 a day; to-day they are in receipt of 75 cents a day. Surely, if there be virtue in legislation these men, hard-working, industrious, independent voters, if you will give them the means of living, ought not to have been reduced to this wretched state of misery. [Applause.]

My heart grows sad and swells with deeper emotions than his did when he was painting with lugubrious but unfaithful colors illiteracy and poverty in Kentucky, as I reflect that the poverty and suffering he has proven and the illiteracy I have shown exist in sight of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, the city of Brotherly Love, where the old Liberty Bell can still be seen; where the first constitutional convention assembled; where the centennial celebration of the Declaration of Independence was held but a few years ago, and where, as civilization halted and took an inventory of our resources and of our vast and varied and wonderful progress, and the first grand volume of personal and national freedom was closed, the suffering and poverty in Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania, if known, would have thrown a blight and gloom over all the proceedings. [Applause.]

He said also—

That the maxim of "Kentucky for Kentuckians" had been so rigidly maintained that there were many counties in the State in which a person of foreign birth could not be found.

If he had examined the Census Report of 1880 before making this statement he would have found that there were in Kentucky in 1880 30,217 foreign-born white voters, exercising all the rights of native-born citizens, and there are perhaps as many more families and an equal number of children under twenty-one years of age, making a total of at least 100,000 persons of foreign birth in Kentucky.

In the district which I have the honor to represent there are four flourishing settlements or colonies of Swedes and Swiss, several hundred in population, and I do not know how many are in the districts represented by other Kentuckians.

We have for a number of years had a bureau of immigration busily looking after immigrants, and a geological survey, both of which have done much good service and been of vast benefit to our State, but the distinguished gentleman seems to have overlooked them or failed to appreciate them.

His statement—

That so extreme was the poverty of a majority of the people of about one-half the counties of the State that they were unable to defray the expense of maintaining county governments, and were therefore known as pauper counties, whose local expenditures had to be paid from the treasury of the State—is as amusing as it is misleading and unfounded.

Under our system in Kentucky there is a general State tax. Last year it amounted to 47½ cents on each \$100 worth of property, since reduced, I believe, to 42½ cents, of which 26 cents is for educational purposes.

Where the amount outside of the school tax collected in the county is more than sufficient to pay the county expenses, the excess goes into the State treasury to assist in defraying the general expenses of the State.

If there is a less amount of tax collected in a county than is needed to pay the necessary expenses of maintaining the county government, such deficiency is paid out of the treasury.

It is not because the counties are wholly unable to defray their expenses, but because in equalizing taxes they do not pay as much as is needed.

If it will give my friend from Pennsylvania any comfort, I will tell him that nearly every county of the so-called pauper counties of Kentucky is Republican in politics. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. That shows that humanity is never totally lost, but there is always some redeeming element. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] Poverty can not extinguish all virtue.

Mr. MCCREARY. If he wants more comfort I will ask him to read the census report of 1880, and he will find that while Kentucky has 2,059 paupers, his State, Pennsylvania, has 12,646 paupers, or more than six times as many as Kentucky. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the maxim that "charity should begin at home" is a beautiful and truthful one, and I commend it to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

When he said on the floor of the House of Representatives, "Kentucky is the most illustrious victim of the whisky trust," why did he not remember that New York, Illinois, and Ohio, paid last year more internal revenue than Kentucky, Illinois paying double as much, and Pennsylvania standing next to Kentucky? Why did he not look into the iron trusts, Bessemer-steel trusts, plow-steel trusts, general steel trusts, and whisky trusts of his own State? If the internal-revenue system has established a despotism in Kentucky, as he states, why has it not also established a despotism in Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, for Pennsylvania made more whisky last year and paid more internal revenue than all the thirteen Southern States, leaving out Kentucky?

A close examination of the last report of the United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows that his own State, Pennsylvania, is

the most illustrious and conspicuous victim of the whisky traffic in the United States save one.

The Commissioner's report shows that Kentucky has 3,598 retail liquor-dealers, and that Pennsylvania has 19,240 retail liquor-dealers. While Kentucky has one saloon to 445 people, Pennsylvania has one saloon to every 204 people. These figures show that the gentleman might evangelize with success in his own State, and that he might read with profit the good words:

First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

[Laughter and applause.]

If the number of saloons indicated are supported now in Pennsylvania, it is impossible to tell how many there would be if his wishes should prevail and the internal-revenue tax removed and free raw whisky allowed to the people.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one more correction I will make in the comedy of errors presented by the distinguished gentleman, but it is a very important one, and I believe he will be surprised when he sees the sunlight of truth.

He said, speaking of Kentucky:

It is a melancholy truth that to speak of her as a leading State, a progressive State, or even a prosperous State, would be to indulge in bitter irony.

Suppressing my fervid feelings for a State which I love so well, and passing without comment her genial climate, unexcelled for healthfulness in any part of the Union; the diversity and fertility of her soil, which will produce an abundance of almost anything that can be grown in any other locality; her rivers, which equal if they do not exceed in number, navigability, length, and supply of water-power, those of any other State; her area of coal lands, which exceed those of any of her sister States; her coking coal area, the largest in the Union and the nearest to extensive deposits of high-grade Bessemer-steel ores; her iron ore, her building stone, and vast forests which have hardly felt the ax of the woodman, I confidently assert that her progress, her prosperity, her possibilities, and her position are fully up to the highest average that can be established for the respective States of this Union.

I gather from the United States census reports and from other reliable and official sources the following facts:

Kentucky is seventh in population among the States of the Union. Instead of being stagnant, as he alleges, her population increased in the decade between 1870 and 1880, 24.8 per cent., being greater than that of thirteen of the other States, including Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, as the ratios of their increase were respectively, 19.99, 17.71, and 21.18 per cent.

The number of miles of railway completed in Kentucky in 1886 was 2,158, while according to the last report of the railroad commissioners 501 additional miles are under contract.

She levies and collects the heaviest school tax collected by any State in this Union, and gives more than one-half of all the taxes collected for general purposes to the education of her children.

She is first in the production of tobacco, producing last year 36 per cent., or over one-third of all the tobacco produced in the United States, and she is unequalled for her flocks and herds and horses. Among the Southern States she stands first in the value of property assessed, and she is first in the production of corn, first in the production of wheat, first in value of farms, first in capital invested in manufactures, and first in value of products of manufactures.

Among the States of the Republic, she is sixth in the production of corn, thirteenth in the valuation of all property, and tenth in the valuation of farms.

In one respect only Kentucky appears to be a laggard and in rear of the procession of States, and far behind Pennsylvania, and that is in her State debt, for she is practically without a State debt, while Pennsylvania heads the list of States with \$19,084,288 of indebtedness.

The report of the inspector of mines in Kentucky shows that the output of coal from all the mines in the State in 1870 was only 169,120 tons. Now the annual output averages 1,500,000 tons, giving employment to about 4,500 persons, and putting in circulation in our mining regions at least \$1,500,000 per annum.

The report of the Bureau of Statistics shows that prior to 1870 the product of iron in Kentucky was insignificant. In 1860 it amounted to only \$804,204. The product in 1885 was \$17,331,237, with an invested capital of \$6,156,431.

The governor of Kentucky, in 1887, said in an address:

The latest report upon the internal commerce of the United States, made by the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, shows that the amount of capital invested in mining and manufacturing industries in Kentucky during the two years ending December 30, 1885, was \$16,707,200; \$20,022,200 more than in Alabama, notwithstanding all that has been said of her remarkable progress; \$31,233,200 more than in Arkansas; \$3,558,200 more than in both combined, and with the exception of these two \$7,335,400 more than all the other Southern States together, and that the increase in 1886 was \$10,100,800 greater than in 1885.

The same authority shows that the increase in the value of products manufactured in the State from 1880 to 1885 was \$16,109,000 greater than the increase for the preceding decade.

While the increase in the sales of leaf-tobacco in the great market at Louisville was 22,279 hogsheads, or 54 per cent. for the ten years from 1870 to 1880, the figures for the following five years was 42,399 hogs-

heads, or 65 per cent., reaching the enormous amount of 107,670 hog-heads in the single year 1885, while for the same year, the last one reported, we had an increase upon the one preceding of 8,124 mules, 11,156 horses, 28,196 cattle, 334,000 bushels of wheat, 18,680,000 bushels of corn and 17,455,000 pounds of tobacco.

If this information does not remove the melancholy which the gentleman from Pennsylvania states depressed him, and convince him that Kentucky is somewhat of a leading, progressive, and prosperous State, he is hopelessly ill.

Mr. Chairman, I was surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should devote nearly one half of his speech, that lasted nearly two hours, to an arraignment of Kentucky, but I could not let that speech go into history and remain in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unanswered, and I was unwilling that my friend from Pennsylvania should not understand the facts about my native State. I hope I have convinced him that he was mistaken.

His assertions were so bald and pointed that I have been compelled to go into details to disprove them, but I have not intended to say a word to wound the sensibilities of any man or that was not indicative of the courtesy which I should extend to the distinguished leader on the Republican side who has been a member of Congress for twenty-seven years.

I give him credit for telling one fact and throwing a ray of sunshine on the blurred and blotted picture he had painted. He said:

Central Kentucky is the seat of a more refined and cultivated pastoral community than I have ever been introduced to elsewhere, unless it was in the southern counties of England. * * * That the soil and native growths of this region of the State contribute, in an exceptional degree, to the physical development of the human race and that of domestic animals is attested by the grand and harmonious development of its men and women, as well as by the almost unchanging superiority of its highly bred flocks and herds and studs of horses, which are the pride of the State.

His arraignment of Kentucky was for the purpose of showing what a blight the internal-revenue tax and the chief article embraced in it had been to Kentucky, and what a blessing the tariff had been to the whole country.

In other words, the purpose was to show that we should have free whisky, free tobacco, and free beer, but the tax should remain high on the necessities of life.

I can not indorse that doctrine, and as long as I have health and strength my voice shall be raised in defense of Kentucky when her good name and fame are assailed.

THE BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means labored hard for months, and the result of their wisdom and industry is the bill now under consideration. It may not come fully up to the wishes of all, but it is a movement in the right direction.

All legislation is the result, more or less, of compromise. The vast and varied interests of our country require concessions to the sentiments, industries, and productions of the different sections, and under all the circumstances which surround us, I am willing to accept the bill reported by the committee.

I can see no evil that can result from a conservative diminution of the taxes as provided by the bill.

The contest is not between tariff and free trade, as some have alleged, but it is between a high tariff and a reasonable tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's hour has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the time of the gentleman from Kentucky be extended.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the time of the gentleman will be extended *ad libitum*, and that he may be allowed to proceed until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. McCREARY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

Mr. KELLEY. I have interrupted the gentleman a great deal myself, and I hope this privilege will be extended to him.

Mr. LANHAM. I will modify my request and ask that the gentleman be permitted to proceed until he has concluded his remarks.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. McCREARY. I thank the members of the House for extending my time until I conclude my remarks.

Mr. McCREARY (resuming). The bill under consideration proposes to reduce, not abolish the tariff.

It takes \$1,756,000 off of earthen and glass ware; \$12,330,000 off of woollens; \$878,000 off of chemicals; \$1,480,000 off of sugar; \$331,000 off of provisions; \$227,000 off of cotton goods; \$3,000 off of books and papers; \$3,121,000 off of other articles, and adds salt, tin-plate, wool, and other things to the free-list, amounting to \$22,189,000, making in all a tariff reduction of \$53,720,000.

It proposes to make a reduction in the internal revenue, including tobacco, of \$24,455,000, leaving out cheroots, cigars, and cigarettes, or a grand tariff and internal-revenue reduction of \$78,176,000.

	Per cent.
Present rate on dutiable goods.....	47.10
Proposed rate on dutiable goods.....	40.00
Present rate on articles affected by bill.....	54.16
Proposed rate on articles affected by bill.....	33.36

The bill also prohibits revenue officers from destroying property seized

by them, which they suppose had been used in illicit distilling, until after presentment or indictment of the owner, and trial and judgment before a proper tribunal.

It repeals all laws which prevent the producer of tobacco from selling it to whom he pleases and in any form except cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots.

It places wool on the free-list, the duty on wool now preventing nearly all the better classes of wool from coming into this country.

The home product can supply only about one-half of the amount required for home consumption.

The statistician of the Agricultural Department estimates the domestic production for the year 1887 at 275,000,000 of pounds. It requires about 600,000,000 pounds of wool and other fibers manufactured with it to supply the annual demand of home consumption, which is more than double the product of our country.

The statement of the committee is so strong on this point that I give it in full, as follows:

We say to the manufacturer we have put wool on the free-list to enable him to obtain foreign wools cheaper, and send them to foreign markets and successfully compete with the foreign manufacturer. We say to the laborer in the factory we have put wool on the free-list so that it may be imported and he may be employed to make the goods that are now made by foreign labor and imported into the United States. We say to the consumer we have put wool on the free-list that he may have woolen goods cheaper. We say to the domestic wool-grower we have put wool on the free-list to enable the manufacturer to import foreign wool to mix with his, and thus enlarge his market and quicken the demand for the consumption of home wool, while it lightens the burdens of the tax-payer.

Salt is also made free. The salt manufacturers of this country are protected by a duty on imported foreign salt equal to about 100 per cent. This has had the effect of building up a number of wealthy and powerful companies.

Salt is a raw material in cheese-making, butter-making, and in meat-packing—three interests that exceed the salt-making interests ten-fold—but our tariff policy forbids our dairymen and meat-packers from buying cheap imported salt, and compels them to buy from the protected home manufacturers in New York, Michigan, and Ohio, at a price which is nearly doubled by the tariff duty.

Hon. R. Q. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, very aptly and forcibly illustrated in his speech the effect of the bill when he said:

I find in the report one pair of 5-pound blankets; the whole cost as stated by the manufacturer is \$2.51. The labor cost he paid for making them is 35 cents. The present tariff is \$1.90. Here is \$1.55 in this tariff over and above the entire labor cost of these blankets. The poor laborer who made the blankets gets 35 cents, and the manufacturer keeps the \$1.90. The bill takes off 90 cents of the tariff duty.

Here is a car-wheel weighing 500 pounds. Cost, \$13. Labor cost 85 cents. Tariff rate is 2½ cents per pound, equal to \$12.50 to cover a labor cost of 85 cents.

Here is a coarse wool suit of clothes, such as our workmen wear in their daily toil in the shop and field. Whole cost is \$12. Labor cost is \$2. The tariff is \$6.48 to cover \$2 of labor.

These are fair illustrations of the effect of the present high protective tariff.

This so-called great "American system" is often said to protect laborers, but it is so perverted that its beneficence stops in the pocket of the employer and leaves the poor laborer to get what he can in the open markets of the world.

OBJECTIONS TO THE BILL.

What are the objections presented to the bill?

The principal objections presented are:

First. That the passage of the bill will paralyze the industry and enterprise of the people and destroy the prosperity of the country.

Second. That the wages of laboring men will be lessened.

When only 2,623,089 persons are engaged in industries which are benefited by the tariff, and there are 57,000,000 people in our country who derive no benefit from the tariff, but are oppressed with its burdens, it is difficult to understand how the industry and enterprise of the people will be paralyzed or the prosperity of the country destroyed by the fair and conservative reduction, both of tariff duties and of internal taxes, provided in the bill.

Indeed, the marvel of the nineteenth century is the success with which less than one-twentieth of the people of our country have controlled legislation for years, in their own interests and to the prejudice of the great multitude.

One of the hobbies of protectionists is the growth of our country in the last twenty years. They point to this and then say, "behold the results of a tariff."

I admit that the vast and varied and wonderful progress, improvement, and advancement of our country in the last twenty years is remarkable, but it has not been because of the tariff, but in spite of it. It should be remembered that there is no country on earth which has the resources, the attractions, the facilities, the opportunities, and the possibilities of ours; that our people are brave, energetic, and intelligent; that we have the most fertile lands in the world, which are freely given away for homesteads; that here we have free speech, free press, free religion, and free suffrage: that ours is the leading nation in the world in education, in inventions, in transportation, and in agriculture, and that it is our great and unprotected agricultural staples, such

as cotton and breadstuffs, whose growth has been the greatest, and but for the great volume of export of these staples our foreign commerce would make but a poor show and the balance of trade would be against us all the time.

During the last fiscal year our total imports amounted to \$692,320,000 and our total exports amounted to \$703,022,923, and of this total \$523,073,798, or 74.41 per cent., were agricultural products, while only \$136,735,105, or 19.45 per cent., were products of manufactures.

I have statistics taken from the United States census reports and from other reliable sources, which show a greater progress and improvement in our country from 1850 to 1860, a low-tariff period, than from 1860 to 1880, a high-tariff period.

As I have said before, the average tariff rate in 1850 was 27 per cent. I leave off decimals. In 1857 it had been reduced to a little over 18 per cent. on dutiable goods. It was raised to an average rate of 40.29 between 1862 and 1866.

Our population in 1850 was 23,191,876. In 1860 it was 31,443,321; an increase of 35.57 per cent. in this decade.

From 1860 to 1870 the population increased to 38,558,371, a gain of 22.62 per cent.; and from 1870 to 1880 to 50,155,783, an addition of 30.07 per cent. Thus the per cent. of increase of our population under a low tariff was greater than under a high tariff.

How has it been with railroads? There were 9,021 miles of railroads in the United States in 1850. The mileage in 1860 was 30,635, an increase of 239.6 per cent. during the low-tariff period. In 1870 there was a mileage of 52,914, a gain of 72.72 per cent. These figures had increased to 93,349 in 1880, a gain of 76.41 per cent. Therefore there was a gain of 239.6 per cent. in ten years of low tariff, from 1850 to 1860, and a gain in mileage of only 204.7 per cent. in the twenty years of high tariff, from 1860 to 1880.

How has it been with our foreign commerce?

In 1856 the value of the total imports and exports of the United States amounted to \$641,604,850, of which American vessels carried \$482,268,274, or a little over 75 per cent. of the whole. In 1887 our total imports and exports reached the sum of \$1,408,502,979, of which there was transported in American vessels \$194,356,746, or only a fraction over 13 per cent.

Twenty years ago our flag, emblematic of American freedom, prosperity, and power, was seen in every port. Now it is rarely seen in any.

I read a published statement not long ago that of the thousands of vessels that passed through the Isthmus of Suez last year not one carried the American flag, and a traveler lately from South America told me this winter that during his travels for nearly a year in that country he did not see the flag of his country on any vessel except one, and that was a Government vessel. This destruction of our foreign carrying trade is the result of the prohibition of American registry to foreign-built ships and the high price of material caused by the tariff.

The effect on ship-building has been equally disastrous.

In 1855 we built in this country 400 vessels for the foreign carrying trade. In 1879 we built but 35. In 1857 the tonnage of sail and steam vessels of the United States engaged in foreign trade was about 3,000,000 tons. After twenty-six years of high tariff it has been reduced to 989,412 tons.

Mexico and the Republics of Central and South America are connected to our Republic by land, and form with the United States part of the western hemisphere. Their governments are fashioned after ours. They have much we need and we have much they need, yet the same system which has driven our flag from the ocean and nearly destroyed our tonnage has nearly destroyed our trade with the countries south of us.

Great Britain sold to the people of the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and Chili last year, \$74,000,000 worth of goods, while we sold them only \$13,000,000 worth.

As I have shown the effect of the tariff on our population, our railroads, our commerce, now let us see its effect on the long-suffering farmer. No class deserves more consideration than that engaged in agriculture. Our farmers control the largest landed interests in the world, and their possessions should be the pride and glory of our citizens. They are engaged in the oldest and largest industry of our country, and 52 per cent. of our entire population are farmers or are directly dependent on them for support. They furnish food for our whole population, and they send abroad three-fourths of the entire exports sent from the United States to foreign countries. They create one-half of the wealth of our country and receive as their share only about 4 per cent. on their investment, and are required by the protective-tariff system to pay an increased cost on the articles they use of four hundred millions to four hundred and fifty millions of dollars annually.

No protective tariff benefits the farmer. On the contrary he is compelled to sell his crops at prices fixed in the great markets of the world. These markets have the whole world from which to draw their supply, and he is compelled to compete with all kinds of labor. The farmer asks no tariff protection, but he is asking in thundering tones for equality under the law.

The census reports tell the difference between the situation of the farmer under a low tariff and a high tariff, as follows:

By the census of 1850 the estimated value of farms in the United

States was \$3,271,575,426. In 1860 the value was estimated at \$6,645,045,007, showing an increased value during this decade of \$3,373,469,581, or more than 100 per cent. In 1870 the value of the farms was estimated at \$9,262,803,861, showing an increase during the decade of \$2,617,758,861, or less than 40 per cent. In 1880 the value of farms was estimated at \$10,197,096,776, being an increase during this decade of \$939,292,915, or only a fraction of 9 per cent.

The value of the live-stock in the United States in 1850 was estimated at \$544,180,566. In 1860 it was valued at \$1,089,329,915. The increase during the decade was \$545,149,349, or over 100 per cent. In 1870 it was estimated at \$1,525,276,547, being an increase during the decade of \$435,946,542, or less than 40 per cent. In 1880 the live-stock was valued at \$1,500,464,609, being a decrease during the decade of nearly \$25,000,000, or more than 1½ per cent.

There seems every reason to believe that between 1850 and 1860 there was a very rapid increase in wealth. In the general prosperity of the country the great farming community appears to have fully participated. Then, as now, it comprised about one-half of all our people. Starting in 1850 with less than \$4,000,000,000, they increased their wealth by more than an equal amount in ten years. But since 1860, with far more than twice as much capital, and added millions of persons employed, they have scarcely been able, even by the highest estimates the census officers could possibly make, to add as much to their wealth in twenty years as they did in the preceding ten.

In 1860 farmers owned half the wealth of the country. In 1880 they owned but a quarter. By the census estimates the other half of the community between 1860 and 1880 increased their wealth by more than \$23,000,000,000. But farmers, starting with an equal capital, increased their wealth during the same time only a little more than \$4,000,000,000.

WAGES.

The next question to answer is, "Will the wages of laboring men be lessened by the passage of the bill?" I think it is clear that they will not. The reduction of tariff duties is so conservative that even if wages were affected by the tariff I do not think the passage of the bill would have any appreciable effect on wages.

The fact is, wages are not governed by the tariff, but by the supply and the demand for labor and by the facilities and opportunities afforded by the country. France has a protective tariff, and yet wages are lower in France than in free-trade England. Germany has still higher protection, and yet wages are lower than in France, and far below what they are in England. I append to my remarks tables which are conclusive on this point.

If the tariff makes wages high Germany and the United States should be the paradise of laboring men, but this is not the case. We find that free-trade England and our tariff-walled Republic, with identical conditions as regards capital and machinery, lead all other nations in the wages of laboring men. No people on earth have been more deluded and humbugged than the workmen of our country have been by monopolists and manufacturers who have continually demanded a high protective tariff for the benefit of American laborers, but who have always pocketed the receipts and let the workman take care of himself.

Did any one ever hear of a manufacturer going out to hunt a high-priced laborer when he could get a low-priced laborer who would perform the same work as promptly and as skillfully? Did a protected manufacturer ever call his laborers around him at the end of the year and propose to divide with them his enormous profits? No; the millionaire manufacturer gets his labor, like the railroad king, in the open markets of the country as cheap as possible.

Not only that, but sometimes Pinkerton detectives are placed at steel works, as was done a few days ago at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, in Pennsylvania, for the purpose of protecting Hungarian immigrants who are going in there to work, while the native American workmen on a strike are at the point of the gun and pistol kept out. Not only that, but on the sacred anniversary of our country's liberty in 1864 an act known as the "contract labor law" was passed, which not only encouraged but legalized the importation of pauper labor from Europe to compete with American labor, and authorized a species of servitude in our free Republic which was as disgraceful as it was despicable. [Applause.]

I read the second section of the act:

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That all contracts that shall be made by emigrants to the United States in foreign countries, in conformity to regulations that may be established by the said Commissioner, whereby emigrants shall pledge the wages of their labor for a term not exceeding twelve months, to repay the expenses of their emigration, shall be held to be valid in law, and may be enforced in the courts of the United States or of the several States and Territories; and such advances, if so stipulated in the contract, and the contract be recorded in the recorder's office in the county where the emigrant shall settle, shall operate as a lien upon any land thereafter acquired by the emigrant, whether under the homestead law when the title is consummated or on property otherwise acquired until liquidated by the emigrant; but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to authorize any contract contravening the Constitution of the United States or creating in any way the relation of slavery or servitude. (United States Statutes at Large, volume 15, 1863-'65.)

A Democratic House of Representatives repealed this entire act in 1885, and a Democratic President approved an amendment to the act repealing it, which made the repealing act more effective in prohibit-

ing the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract to perform labor in the United States.

I hope the day is not far distant when the laboring men will shake off the thralldom which monopolists and manufacturers have so long imposed upon them. They should be as free and equal before the law with their employers as they are before their God.

Capital and labor should stand together as twin sisters, recognizing the fact that united they will stand and be prosperous, divided they will fall and be injured, if not destroyed.

Stupendous efforts first gave freedom of thought. Then in the blood of saints and martyrs religious freedom was obtained. Then political liberty was achieved in our great Republic. The full measure of human liberty will be obtained when we also have real industrial freedom. [Applause.]

DOES THE TARIFF PROTECT LABOR?

The last census shows that there are 17,392,099 of our people engaged in all kinds of industries. Seven million six hundred and seventy thousand four hundred and ninety-three are employed in agriculture, 1,139,362 in professional services, 2,934,876 are laborers and domestics, 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, 1,214,023 are carpenters, masons, blacksmiths, builders, bakers, plasterers, tailors, agricultural-implement-makers, shoemakers, railroad employes, milliners, dressmakers, and other miscellaneous occupations, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff.

Thus it appears that 14,769,010 persons who perform six-sevenths of the labor done in this country are thoroughly taxed and fleeced for the benefit of 2,623,089, but only a few thousand of the last-named number receive the profits of the tariff. They are the owners and lords of the factories, the nabobs of the "trusts," the "pools," and the "combinations," who make often from 30 per cent. to 50 per cent. per annum on their investments.

The 2,000,000 laborers employed in manufacturing or mining are not protected by the tariff, because they must compete with 8,500,000 other laborers in this country and with all the laborers of the world (except the Chinese, who are prohibited from coming here), and in addition to this they are compelled to pay the increased price for clothing, shelter, food, and home conveniences produced by the tariff.

While there is a tariff on thousands of things, there is no tariff on labor. When we come to the poor laborer we find absolute free trade. The manufactures of Europe can not be shipped here without paying a high duty, but European labor, and often pauper labor, comes here without paying a cent of duty. The tariff does not protect American labor. It protects the article on which it is laid by shutting out or lessening foreign importations.

As, for instance, a tariff on iron protects iron, a tariff on blankets protects blankets, a tariff on silk protects silk, but a tariff on iron does not protect blankets or laborers. The tariff must be on the thing protected. As there is no tariff on labor, of course labor is on the free-list.

PROTECTIVE TARIFF OUTGROWTH.

Twenty-seven years of protection have produced strange offspring. Who ever heard of a tramp in our country twenty years ago? Now they are seen daily, and almost hourly, in the by-ways and in the public places. Who ever heard of strikes and lockouts in our Republic until our high protective tariff period?

The advance sheets of the third annual report of the Commissioner of Labor show, in the six years from 1881 until 1886, there have been strikes in 22,336 establishments. Of these 16,692, or 74.74 per cent., were in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Illinois, where protection is claimed to have wrought such wonders for the laboring man. There were lockouts during the same period in 2,182 establishments. Of these 1,981, or 90.8 per cent., occurred in the five States named. The number of employes striking and involved was 1,324,152. In addition to these there were 159,548 employes locked out, 31.22 per cent. of whom were females.

Of the 22,336 establishments in which strikes occurred, the strikes in 18,342, or 82.12 per cent. of the whole, were ordered by labor organizations; while of the 2,182 establishments in which lockouts occurred, 1,753, or 80.34 per cent., were ordered by combinations of managers.

The loss to the strikers as given was \$51,819,163. The loss to employers through lockouts was \$8,132,717, or a total wage loss to employes of \$59,951,880. It occurred in 24,518 establishments. The average loss was \$2,415 to each establishment, and nearly \$40 to each person involved.

Will gentlemen say, after pondering these disturbances, that the tariff law makes our country an Eden for laboring men, or will they rather say its—

—inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn?

Investigations started by the Agricultural Department and pursued by other inquirers have brought to light the mortgages held in Eastern States on the farms in the West. The South is not touched in the report, but the appalling statement is made that mortgages in ten States of the West reach the sum of \$3,422,000,000, being three times the

bonded debt of the United States, and these mortgages draw an average interest amounting to over \$200,000,000 annually. They are held by Eastern men, and are distributed as follows:

Ohio.....	\$701,000,000	Iowa.....	\$351,000,000
Indiana.....	398,000,000	Nebraska.....	140,000,000
Illinois.....	620,000,000	Kansas.....	200,000,000
Wisconsin.....	250,000,000	Missouri.....	237,000,000
Michigan.....	350,000,000		
Minnesota.....	175,000,000	Total.....	3,422,000,000

CONCLUSION.

Mr. Chairman, I have already occupied more time than I intended. The issues which I have been trying to discuss are the issues that are ringing throughout the length and breadth of our country. They are not new.

Nearly four years ago the Democracy in national convention gave solemn pledge to—

Reduce taxation to the lowest limit consistent with due regard to the preservation of the faith of the nation to its creditors and pensioners.

And our brave and able President in his last annual message to the Congress of the United States declared:

The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers.

Mr. Chairman, the question of taxation stands next to free government. I am glad to be a member of a Congress to which a President sent an annual message entirely on tax reform, and which is true to the principles and teachings of the Democratic party from its organization by Jefferson at the beginning of this century to the present time.

I am proud to live in a Republic which has a Chief Magistrate so brave and patriotic and so mindful of his obligations to the people as to be willing to do his duty and follow the dictates of his heart, let the consequences be what they may; and I rejoice that I live at a time when the questions of reasonable taxation for the economical maintenance of the Government and high protective taxation to make the rich richer and the poor poorer are to be fairly tried before the voters of the greatest republic on the earth. [Applause.]

There can be, in my judgment, but one result. There will be a reform of tariff duties. The people's money, heretofore piled up in the Treasury, will flow again into the channels of commerce and trade to gladden the hearts of laboring men and benefit the vast and varied interests of our land.

The party organized by Jefferson, whose principles have been so ably and honestly supported by Cleveland, will triumph, and with "Peace on earth, good will toward men" as a sweet benediction, our country will move on to the accomplishment of its grand and glorious destiny. [Great applause.]

The following are the tables referred to by Mr. McCREARY.

Table showing average weekly wages paid in the enumerated occupations in different European countries.

[Furnished by Bureau of Labor, Washington, D. C.]

Occupation.	Austria.	Belgium.	France.	Germany.	Great Britain.	Holland.	Switzerland.
Blacksmiths.....	\$3.18	\$5.38	\$5.81	\$4.00	\$7.37	\$4.80	\$5.20
Bricklayers.....	3.55	4.56	5.74	4.21	7.56	4.80	5.21
Hod-carriers.....	2.60	3.22	3.13	2.92	4.94	3.60	2.99
Carpenters and joiners	5.10	4.07	6.20	4.11	7.66	4.80	4.74
Coopers.....	3.64	5.17	5.58	3.97	7.50	4.80	4.78
Harness and saddle makers	3.60	5.51	5.70	3.69	6.63	5.20
Masons.....	3.40	5.22	5.33	4.67	7.68	4.80	5.27
Painters.....	4.82
Plasterers.....	4.01	4.66	6.34	4.43	7.80	4.00	5.03
Plumbers.....	4.11	5.46	6.10	4.26	7.90	4.80	5.18
Tailors.....	4.03	5.58	5.02	3.41	7.40	5.00	6.35
Tinsmiths.....	3.70	4.40	5.46	3.55	6.56	4.00	4.40
Servants (domestic).....	7.00	3.34	3.75	3.90
Farm laborers.....	3.50	2.72	3.10	3.06	4.02	3.24

Facts relating to foreign countries are taken from the report on foreign labor published by the Department of State, 1885.

[See tables on following page.]

COST OF LIVING—MASSACHUSETTS AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Rents are 89.62 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. Board and lodging is 39.01 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Fuel is 104.96 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Clothing is 45.06 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Dry goods are 13.26 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Boots and shoes are 62.59 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Groceries are 16.18 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Provisions are 23.08 per cent. higher in Great Britain than in Massachusetts.

The above facts are taken from the report of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics for 1884.

State.	Industry.	Occupation.	Daily hours of labor.	Average daily wages.	Labor cost, one ton.		Number of employes in the establishment.	Per cent. of employes.		
					Description of unit.	Amount.		Male.	Female.	Youth.
Belgium	Pig-iron	All employes in the establishment	12	\$0.53	White pig	\$0.97	572	78	6	16
Do	do	Filler	12	.65	Run of the furnace pig	.97	374	100		
Great Britain	do	All employes in the establishment	12	.89	Run of the furnace foundry pig	1.87	98	100		
Do	do	Filler	12	1.26	No. 1 foundry pig	2.48	72	100		
Alabama	do	All employes in the establishment	12	.88	Run of the furnace foundry pig	1.25	.25	100		
Do	do	Filler	12	1.50	do	2.00	.56	100		
Maryland	do	All employes in the establishment	12	1.30	do	1.55	.73	100		
Do	do	Filler	12	1.25	do	1.28	1.14	100		
Ohio	do	All employes in the establishment	12	1.24						
Do	do	Filler	12	1.10						
Pennsylvania	do	All employes in the establishment	12	1.42						
Do	do	Filler	12	1.65						
New York	do	All employes in the establishment	12	1.36						
Do	do	Filler	12	1.50						
Virginia	do	All employes in the establishment	12	1.23						
Do	do	Filler	12	1.30						

State.	Industry.	Occupation.	Daily hours of labor.	Average daily wages.	Labor cost of one yard.		Number of employes in establishment.	Per cent. of employes.		
					Description of unit.	Amount of cost.		Male.	Female.	Youth.
France	Print-cloth	All employes in the establishment	11	\$0.56	56+64, weight 3½ yards per pound.	\$0.00983	201	23	74	3
Do	do	Spinner								
Do	do	Weaver		0.54						
Germany	do	All employes in the establishment	12	0.49			2,452	36	49	15
Do	do	Spinner		0.88						
Do	do	Weaver		0.46						
Great Britain	do	All employes in the establishment	10	0.75	64+64, weight 8 yards per pound.	.00802	306	15	62	23
Do	do	Spinner		1.48						
Do	do	Weaver		0.90						
Connecticut	do	All employes in the establishment	11	0.97	64+64, weight 7 yards per pound.	.00972	308	36	46	18
Do	do	Spinner		1.62						
Do	do	Weaver		1.02						
Massachusetts	do	All employes in the establishment	10	0.92	64+64, weight 7 yards per pound.	.01000	752	17	68	15
Do	do	Spinner		1.65						
Do	do	Weaver		0.95						
Italy	Cotton yarn	All employes in the establishment	12	.31	16	.0193	1,047	34	46	20
Do	do	Spinner		.73						
Germany	do	All employes	12	.65	32	.02259	442			
Do	do	Spinner		.71						
France	do	All employes	12	.60	32	.02525	201	57	20	23
Do	do	Spinner		.96						
Great Britain	do	All employes	10	.80	40	.01943	253	37	20	43
Do	do	Spinner		1.23						
North Carolina	do	All employes	11½	.65	20	.0230	78	26	30	44
Do	do	Spinner		.45						
New York	do	All employes	11	.93	10-30	.02410	94	36	23	36
Do	do	Spinner		1.75						

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to ask unanimous consent of the committee to consume some ten or twelve minutes before the gentleman next to be recognized shall take the floor; in other words, I ask to have that much time in my own right.

Mr. McCREARY. I hope unanimous consent will be given the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and I ask that it be granted to him.

Mr. KELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to make to Kentucky or to her gallant sons for my description of the condition of affairs in that State; but I desire to correct what appears to have been a clerical error on a single point in my remarks.

On page 23 of my printed remarks I find that in speaking of Kentucky I used the following language:

Her territory is contiguous to seven States, the population of which numbered in 1880 more than 14,000,000, which together include 307,925 square miles, and were intersected at the close of last year by 33,555 miles of railroad over which her travel and traffic might be connected with and enjoy the benefits of our entire system of local and transcontinental lines. Her area is 41,283 square miles. Her population—

And I call the gentleman's attention specially to these words—

Her population in 1880 numbered 1,648,690, and in 1887 there were 2,070 miles of railroad operated within her limits.

I also said that she had more square miles of coal than England ever had; that the coal fields of Kentucky exceed in extent and richness those of England as they came from nature. But the error which has been brought to my attention is that I used, in referring to the measure of illiteracy, the school figures and referred to them as representing the total population.

In comparison with Pennsylvania, the official record of the census in a general comparison of all the States, sent to the Hon. Albert S. Willis, of Kentucky, from the Census Bureau, shows that while Pennsylvania had but 3.41 per cent. of population who could not read, Kentucky had 15.66 per cent., or nearly five times the percentage of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCREARY. From what paper is the gentleman reading?

Mr. KELLEY. From the report sent by George W. Richards, acting Superintendent of the Census, to Hon. Albert S. Willis, of Kentucky, in response to an inquiry addressed by him asking for a comparative statement on this subject.

Mr. McCREARY. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would use the figures given by the United States census reports.

Mr. KELLEY. Why, this is from the Superintendent of the Census. The total number of persons over ten years of age returned as unable to read in Kentucky was 258,186, or 22.2 per cent.; and the number returned as unable to write 348,393, or 29.9 per cent. My mistake was in not noting the fact that the latter total embraced the former, while I added them together.

Of the white persons of the age of ten years and over the total num-

ber is given at 973,275, of which number, as I have said, 214,497, or 22 per cent. were unable to read. But of the native white population of Kentucky ten years old and upward, numbering 914,311, there were unable to write, according to this table, 208,796, or 22.8 per cent., showing a considerably increased percentage of illiteracy amongst the native white population as compared to that of the total white population. That fact is accounted for in this way. The total foreign-born whites in this State were 58,964. The number of them who were unable to write was 5,701, or of foreign white citizens 9.7 per cent. against 22.8 per cent. of the native white population. I shall correct the figures in my printed paper if it can be done.

Now, I desire to say that I made no statement reflecting upon the condition of Kentucky that could wound any sensibility that I did not utter in the course of my remarks in the Louisville opera house when I was addressing the assembled business men of the State of Kentucky.

Mr. McCREARY. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I desire to state that in my remarks I wish it to be understood distinctly that what I said was prompted by the kindest motives and with no intention to wound the feelings or offend the sensibilities of anybody.

Mr. KELLEY. I believe that; and appreciate the gentleman's courteous manners.

Mr. McCREARY. I only desired to correct the mistake which I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania had fallen into, but had not deliberately made.

Mr. KELLEY. And I want to say to the gentleman that I received authority for all my statements in the conference of business men of Kentucky, which I had been invited to address; and that I produced in support of my statements here extracts from my address to that body taken from the *Courier-Journal* of the succeeding morning. No, sir; I said nothing here that I had not said to my hosts in the opera house at Louisville. So I repeat if I have slandered Kentucky, the business men of the State, in conference assembled, crammed me with the slanders which were printed next morning in the *Courier-Journal* with no intimation that they were slanders.

Mr. McCREARY. I wish to say, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me, that in answering his remarks to-day I did not refer to anything in his speech delivered in Kentucky. The extract I made is taken from the speech he made here the other day, and not from the speech he made at Louisville, which he incorporated in his remarks.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman is mistaken. It was from that address the phrase "laggard" came. I never used it but on that occasion. I did then speak of Kentucky as a laggard, and said to the gentlemen of that convention that as I sat and listened to them it appeared to me "that they were crying aloud to each other, if not to the Almighty, what shall we do to be saved?"

Mr. McCREARY. I hold in my hand the printed speech sent out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and in that speech, not in what is taken from the Kentucky speech, but in the portion in larger type, I find this:

Mr. Chairman, my suggestion that there was something wrong in the condition of Kentucky and my inquiries as to what caused her to be a laggard even among the Southern States, etc.

Mr. KELLEY. What page are you reading from?

Mr. McCREARY. Page 29. I have the extract marked, and it is what you said on the floor of the House.

Mr. KELLEY. If you will look above a little you will see that I was quoting my Louisville speech. I quote it now:

There is something wrong in Kentucky or these stories could not be circulated about her without contradiction.

And I am repeating what I said to that convention, and it is in close type.

Why, years ago Kentucky was selling nails to Pennsylvania; the first machine for cutting and heading nails was invented and constructed in Kentucky. Yes, Lexington for many years shipped nails to Pittsburgh; but the trade has gone now; you do not do it now; you have not tried to do it. What is the secret of the failure?

That was quoted in my recent speech from the *Courier-Journal* report of my Louisville address. A distinguished gentleman of Kentucky took me to the city of Winchester, and being there he and others said to me: "You are now in a city in which no house was built during the last half century." I was then taken by a party of Winchester (Ky.) Democrats to see the house which was the last one that had been built in more than fifty years before the spirit of the new South came into Winchester, and under the impulse of which many dwelling-houses, a Methodist college, and two normal schools were being built.

Mr. McCREARY. I know the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him to ask him a question which brings out the success of a city which entertained the gentleman so handsomely. Will he tell this House how many houses have gone up there within the past two years?

Mr. KELLEY. I do not remember the number, but I eulogized the enterprise of Louisville all through my address. I told my hearers that Louisville holds the same relation to the expanding Southwest that that marvel of commercial growth, Chicago, bears to the great Northwest. They did not understand me to be offensive, nor was I, in the tone of any of my remarks.

Again, one of the most distinguished men of Kentucky said: "You can better estimate the condition of the mountaineers of our wealthy coal regions by a little prayer uttered by one of their ministers, of which I will give you a copy."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. I would like to read the prayer referred to, as I sympathize with its humane and Christian spirit. It was as follows

O Lord, may the time soon come when the jingle of the sang hoe and the grate of the gritter may be heard no more forever.

If gentlemen want to know what the "grate of the gritter" and the "jingle of the sang hoe" are they can get the information by extending my time two minutes. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROUT. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended for two minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. I was told by an eminent Kentuckian, who has given me much valuable information by his reports as well as in my pleasant social intercourse with him, that this prayer illustrates one department of agriculture and one department of culinary service. The "sang hoe" is a small hoe of domestic manufacture, with which the people dig ginseng root, which is the only agricultural staple of a portion of the mountain district in Southeastern Kentucky.

Mr. McCREARY. Is that the Republican district you are referring to?

Mr. KELLEY. It is a Kentucky district; and the fact that Republicanism prevails there shows that poverty, however terrible it may be, can not obliterate all of the best impulses of humanity.

So much for the "sang hoe." Now, what is the "grate of the gritter?" That is heard in kitchens. The "gritter" is a piece of cast-away tin or sheet-iron, through which holes have been punched with a nail, so as to throw out the surface on one side and make it rough. In its use it is what we would call a grater. It is used by good Kentucky women, in the midst of such wealth of minerals and timber as Pennsylvania never had, for rubbing the green corn from the cob in order to cook it for a family meal. So that now you know what the "jingle of the sang hoe" and the "grate of the gritter" are. The spirit of the new South will probably substitute better implements for both of them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FORAN. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of this House, during almost every session at which I was present, I have heard gentlemen denounce and condemn and breathe out fiery invective against the protective system of this country. I have listened to messages and documents read from the Clerk's desk, inveighing in the most bitter terms against the tariff. Gentlemen, otherwise calm, suave, and dignified, I have seen when this subject was under discussion become satirical, abusive, censorious, captious—almost common scolds. I have heard the tariff characterized as "vicious, inequitable, and illogical," cruel and merciless—in fact the whole vocabulary of invective and scold words have been hurled at it, in season and out of season—in order and out of order—until I almost fancied and was made to believe that every manufacturer in the country was a being of whom it could be said—

Through life's dark road his sordid way he wends,
An incarnation of fat dividends.

Nay, more, I came to fancy and almost believe that the tariff was another Minos to whom the people paid tribute, that the manufacturers were the Minotaurs who devoured the tribute, and that the only Theseus who could deliver us from this galling thralldom was the star-eyed deity of free trade. Nor was this all, for my imagination has, at times, been so wrought upon by the glowing and fervid eloquence of these gentlemen that it painted every consumer a Sinbad, and the tariff an old man of the sea that clung to the consumer as closely as the shirt of Nessus. But it was only fancy and imagination, which, like a morning mist, fled at the first touch of the sunlight of truth and investigation.

How much does this great burden figure up in dollars? What is the weight of this old man of the sea which each person in the United States has to bear? The revenues of the United States from all sources during the year 1887 were \$371,403,277, or about \$6 per capita. Of this \$154,116,364 came from internal revenue, land sales, and miscellaneous sources. There is no complaint made about this tax. Just at this time temperance fanatics, if they happen to be free-traders, benignly smile upon and lovingly caress the florid face of old John Barleycorn. The balance, \$217,286,893, came from customs duties, and is the bone of contention. It is upon this tax that the vials of wrath have been so unsparingly poured. It has been computed by very careful statisticians that of the customs tax only about \$85,000,000 are collected from articles of prime necessity. I do not include in this estimate sugar, because the committee has seen fit to leave it practically untouched. They treated it, whether they so regarded it or not, as a purely revenue commodity.

Now, if it were admitted that the \$85,000,000, which is collected from articles of prime necessity, is added to the cost of home-made articles of similar character to the imported articles upon which it is laid, still the burden would be only about \$1.25 per capita, or about what

we now pay for pensions. Here, then, is the incubus—the old man of the sea—the mountain of oppression and iniquity which is crushing and paralyzing the farmer and the consumer—\$1.25 per annum. But I propose presently to show that scarcely a dollar of this \$85,000,000 is added to the cost of home-made articles of the same kind as those upon which it is laid. But I desire to first call attention to the fact that the committee do not appear to have had, when they framed this bill, a very alarming conception of the burden which is fastened with "relentless grasp" upon the people. I take it that the committee knew what they were doing and that they honestly endeavored to meet the "condition" with which we are confronted. This "condition" is an annual surplus of nearly \$60,000,000. The duty of the committee, supposing of course that their only object was to meet the "condition," was to frame a bill that would prevent any further augmentation of this surplus. Have they done so? If this bill is passed will the "condition" disappear, and if so, will it, like Banquo's ghost, rise again to haunt and plague those who are responsible for its attempted taking off? Let us see. The bill places upon the free-list articles which in 1887 yielded a revenue of \$22,189,505.

This reduction we are sure of, as well as a reduction of internal taxation to the amount of \$24,455,607 if the bill should pass; but these two items will only reduce the revenue \$46,645,202, leaving us still about \$15,000,000 away from the "condition." Oh, but, say the committee, we have carved and butchered this "vicious, inequitable, and illogical" tariff, we have so badly wounded and crippled it that it will not yield during the coming year within \$31,530,941 as much as it did in 1887; that is, we estimate a still further reduction of over \$31,000,000 because of the cutting, slashing, and carving we have done. But there will be no such reduction, and these gentlemen know it. In groping through the labyrinthian corridors of the tariff, their footsteps must have been guided by the light of the lamp of experience. Possibly the distinguished chairman may have snatched a ball of woolen thread from the industry he proposes to ruthlessly destroy, and thus have performed the feat of Theseus by the aid of this woolen Ariadne—at least wool and its products seem to be the pivot upon which the wheel of the scheme revolves. But to the point. I venture the assertion that should this bill pass, within three years from the date of its passage the customs revenues will be greater than they are to-day. I base this assertion upon the experience of the past. By the act of July 14, 1870, the free-list was enlarged \$2,403,000, and an estimated reduction from the dutiable list of \$23,651,748 was made. This was a total reduction of over \$26,000,000. The revenue from customs during the year 1870 was \$194,538,374. The revenue from this source during 1871, instead of being \$26,000,000 less, was \$206,270,408, or nearly twelve millions more than it was the year before the estimated reduction was made; during the following year, 1872, the revenue rose to \$216,370,287. This is the way the reduction of duties reduces customs revenue.

The act of May 1, 1872, placed tea and coffee upon the free-list. The revenue derived from these articles amounted to \$15,893,847. By the act of June 6, of the same year, the free-list was still further enlarged to the extent of \$3,345,724, and reductions were made from the dutiable list, which it was estimated would amount to \$11,933,191. These two acts made a total reduction, free-list and estimated, of \$31,172,762. The customs revenue for 1872 was \$216,370,287. The revenue for 1873 amounted to \$188,089,523, nearly \$4,000,000 more than it was estimated to be by reason of the reductions of the previous year. By the act of March 3, 1883, the free-list was still further enlarged \$1,365,999, and reductions were made upon articles on the dutiable list, which it was estimated would still further reduce the revenue \$19,489,800, or a total reduction of \$20,855,799. The customs revenue during the year 1883 was \$214,706,497. During the years 1884-'85 there was a slight falling off in the revenues from this source; but during the year 1887 the customs revenue amounted to \$217,286,893, or nearly three millions more than it was during the year 1883, when an estimated reduction of over \$20,000,000 was made. In 1866, the first year after the war, the customs revenue amounted to \$179,046,652. By the acts of July 6, 1870, May 1, 1872, June 6, 1872, and March 3, 1883, the customs revenue was reduced by free-list and reductions upon articles on the dutiable list \$78,093,309 annually, and yet, notwithstanding this enormous reduction, the revenue derived from customs during the year 1887 was \$32,240,241 more than it was during the year 1866, before these reductions were made. In the light of this experience, what reason have we to hope that this bill will permanently reduce, in any appreciable degree, the present customs revenue?

The revenue from this source was greater last year than any year since the close of the war except 1882, when it was about three millions larger than it was last year. How is this increase accounted for? It can be accounted for in no way except by increased importations, and these increased importations, made possible by the reductions of duties, are so great that they largely overbalance the free-list, which has been increased from time to time. It seems to me that in the light of this experience, or of these facts, there is nothing clearer than that a reduction of the customs duty upon any article which is now in competition with a home product, will increase the importation of that article so largely that notwithstanding the reduction of duty the revenue will be largely increased. It may be claimed that the increase here shown is due to the increase of our population. I do not concede

this; but grant that it is true, how will that help us out of the difficulty? The President says we are confronted by a "condition," the surplus. The facts I have here stated demonstrate beyond controversy that we can not meet this "condition" upon the lines marked out in this bill.

There are only two ways of meeting the "condition" and preventing a further accumulation of surplus, and that is by the reduction of internal-revenue taxation or by enlarging the free-list to an amount equal to the annual surplus, to do which would wipe out and forever destroy the whole American protective system. I am loath to believe that the gentlemen who framed this bill did not understand what effect previous reductions of duty had upon the amount of revenue collected or goods imported. They certainly must have been aware of these things, and I am therefore reluctantly and much against my will compelled to believe that the projectors of this bill were governed, rather by a desire to cut and slash the tariff than to honestly meet the "condition," which the President of the United States expected them to meet, and which the best interests of the country demanded they should meet, and that is, to prevent an unnecessary absorption of the circulating medium of the country and prevent its being hoarded in the Treasury and taken from the channels of trade and commerce. But what does this bill in reality accomplish? A reduction of a little over \$46,000,000, \$24,455,607 of which is taken from tobacco. Of this tobacco tax the gentlemen who have so vigorously in times past denounced the tariff never complained, so that the only reduction the committee saw fit to make from the "vicious, inequitable, and illogical" tariff that could be applied to meet the "condition" is the \$22,189,505 which constitutes the free-list provided for in this bill. Notwithstanding the vehement and fiery eloquence and vindictive aspersions with which the tariff has been assailed upon this floor by members of the House, and by the President and some members of his Cabinet, yet the committee did not dare to enlarge the free-list beyond \$22,189,505; and this is in reality the only reduction which this bill, if passed, will make in customs taxation.

It therefore seems to me that this bill is a humiliating confession that all the evil things which these gentlemen have said concerning the tariff are not true. Twenty-two million dollars is about 6 per cent. of the total taxation of the United States, or about 35 cents per capita. Thirty-five cents a year, then, in the estimation of the committee, is the terrible burden that has weighed down the farmer and consumer—this is the heavy load that has curved the spine and paralyzed the energies of the laborer for lo! these many years. In view of all these things I am irresistibly driven to the conclusion that this measure is intended rather as an attack upon the protective system of America than an honest attempt to reduce the annual surplus.

Mr. Chairman, watch any gentleman while advocating this bill—mark him well, for some time during his discourse his face will become transfigured—

While shakes his ambrosial curls, and gives the nod,
The stamp of fate, and sanction of the god.

Behold! He strikes an attitude, such as the old masters gave Jove when launching his thunderbolts; there is a terrible glitter in his eye, which is "in fine frenzy rolling," and there bursts from his throat, like a shell from a cannon, these words, which appal the ear and strike terror to the heart as they bellow through the vast and boundless recesses of this Hall: "Shall the blanket of the poor man be taxed and whisky be free?" These words have been ringing in my ears, dancing in my brain, until in the wild delirium of a fever-racked imagination I heard some millions cry, "Whisky! whisky! Open, ye stills of Kentucky, and pour the mighty deluge and flood a thirsting world! Ye earthquakes, split the globe, the solid rock-ribbed globe, and lay all bare its subterranean spirit rivers and fresh-whisky seas!"—while other millions I did see, blanketless and shirtless, shake and shiver and "wallow naked in December snow."

From this mental mirage I turn to the stern realities of hard facts and figures. I find that in the estimation of the committee this "vicious, inequitable, illogical" tax which forces the consumer to "wallow naked in December snow," amounts to \$17,720,635. That is the amount of free-list and estimated reductions on wool and woolen goods.

Many of the gentlemen who have of this tax sung such sad refrains as would draw "iron tears down Pluto's cheek" and cause every farmer to think himself a "child of misery baptized in tears," fought like valiant knights, and lengthened a day into a week, in a bold attempt to take from the Treasury just about that amount of money. The direct-tax bill carries just about the amount the committee thinks the consumer pays on woolen goods. Year after year, upon this floor, gentlemen who shed scalding tears because the poor man's blanket is taxed, vote without a heart pang or qualm of conscience for river and harbor improvements about as much money as the committee say the consumer is unjustly taxed on woolen goods. Seventeen million seven hundred thousand dollars, then, is the amount, after all, that is wrung "with relentless grasp" from the consumer by this tax. This is about 4½ per cent. of the entire tax the people pay, or about 29 cents per capita.

Twenty-nine cents, then, is the monstrous sum which this "cruel and merciless" tax wrenches from a single man every year. What an enormous hole this fabulous amount must leave in his income. Is it

any wonder that the young men of the present day can not afford to marry? How could they afford to marry and also pay a tax of 29 cents a year? Adopt female suffrage and the party that would dare to continue this burdensome tax would be swept from power with the rapidity of the red-winged lightening.

Free whisky? I have not the figures, but I venture the assertion that the tax on the alcohol that is used in the manufacture of drugs and on the liquors used in the sick room, amounts to as much as the tax which the committee say is unjustly wrung from the consumer on woolen goods. Why did the committee, if the love they profess for the poor man is genuine, not endeavor, at least, to give him cheap medicine? Will any gentleman of the committee answer? In these comparisons I have admitted, for the sake of the argument, that the claim of the free-trader that the duty is added to the cost of the home-made article is true. The protectionist claims it is not true; but suppose we concede the free-trader to be half right, for the sake of further comparison, and then take into account the fact that poor men do not buy as much woolen clothing as the wealthy or middle classes, and where do we find ourselves? That the wool and woolen tax amounts to scarcely 12 cents per capita. Surely there has been, on this subject, a great deal of cry and very little wool. But why should the farmer and the manufacturer be placed in antagonism? Are they not correlatives in the operations of nature? Then why should they not be correlatives in the operations of human industry? When the farmer and the manufacturer are separated by long distances is not the middleman, the trader, the agent, and above all the transporter, a severe tax upon the energies and activities of both? When they are brought together, as they are by the protective system, this tax is to a large extent removed.

I think I have some personal knowledge of this subject. I was born in a farm-house and hoed my own row on a farm. I remember how the farmer prospered under the ad valorem tariff of 1846. It was in reality a free-trade tariff, as is always an ad valorem tariff that does not contain provision for the forfeiture of falsely invoiced goods. Under the operations of the tariff of 1846 the farmers of my native county sold their cattle and surplus products to drovers, traders, and agents, who had them transported to New York on the Erie canal and on the Erie road after it was built. For the farmer, in those days, there was mighty bad sledding on the road to Hard Scrabble. He was fleeced by middlemen, and frequently ruined by wildcat banks and depreciated currency. We did not, during those halcyon days of free trade, lay awake nights lest the nightmare of a woolen tax would freeze our blood. There was no such tax to annoy us. Our mothers spun the wool we sheared from the sheep we raised on the farm and wove the thread into cloth on a hand-loom. This was the only woolen cloth we wore. Last fall my county celebrated the centennial of its first settlement, during which time I revisited the glimpses of my childhood. Fancy's magic wand could not create a more striking change than I beheld—beautiful farms, neat and substantial buildings furnished with all modern improvements everywhere greeted the eye. In twenty-five years the thriving manufacturing towns of Binghamton and Owego, Susquehanna and Great Bend, have grown until their population is nearly 100,000. These towns are either in or upon the borders of my native county. The middleman has disappeared, the consumer and the producer, the farmer and the manufacturer are side by side, and both are prosperous and happy; and this is the condition of things in every State where has been adopted the American policy of bringing into proportionate and harmonious relation the four great branches of industry—agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, and transportation. Need I say more; can more be said upon this phase of the question?

The eminent gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in presenting this bill to the House undertook, with an ardor and persistency worthy of a better cause, to show that the high rate of wages paid in the United States is not due to the protective system. The gentleman well knew and fully appreciated the fact that if it was admitted that the protective system enhanced the price of labor it would be extremely dangerous to in any way mutilate or injure that system. He is well aware that labor is the pivotal point around which this discussion centers. The main portion of his argument, therefore, was intended to demonstrate that the high rate of wages paid in the United States is due to coal, steam, and machinery. He says:

It is these three powerful agents that multiply the products of labor and make it more valuable, and that high wages means low cost of product.

I admit that a high rate of wages means a low cost of product. That is an economic axiom half a century old. Having established this fact, and I do not deny it, the gentleman asks why it is that while the labor cost is lower in the United States while the rate of wages is higher, yet England produces her goods at a total cost lower than ours. His answer to this question is that labor does not cause this difference, but that it is caused by the cost of the material; that England has cheaper machinery and cheaper raw material than we have, and therefore the total cost of any given product is lower in England than in the United States, notwithstanding the higher rate of wages paid by us. Upon this point I take issue with the gentleman from Texas. He seems to have overlooked the all-important fact that capital is cheaper in England than it is in the United States. England has been able, quite recently, to

fund her entire national debt at 2½ per cent. Four per cent. has been the lowest rate at which we could fund any appreciable amount of our public debt for any considerable length of time. In old, wealthy countries money is always cheaper than it is in countries comparatively new and poor. Money is cheaper in New York than it is in Chicago, and cheaper in Chicago than it is in Kansas City. The farther you go from the moneyed centers the dearer money becomes.

Now let us apply this quantity to the Mills equation and see if the answer to the problem will not be different. Suppose, for instance, that a plant costing a million dollars is to be erected in Pennsylvania or Ohio. The capital stock of such a plant could not be sold upon our markets unless a dividend of at least 6 per cent. was guaranteed, and for the reason that the money of capitalists is now earning that amount or more. Capital to establish a similar plant in England could be easily procured for 3 per cent. The interest cost of the American plant would, therefore, be \$60,000 a year, while the interest cost of the English plant would be but \$30,000 a year; so that it will be seen that the American plant would have to withdraw from its earnings \$30,000 a year before it would be upon the same plane as the English plant. This \$30,000 added to the total cost of the American product will perhaps account for most of the difference in the cost of producing goods in each country. Let me quote against the distinguished free-trader from Texas a distinguished English free-trader. Mr. J. E. Cairnes is an eminent English publicist and writer of the free-trade school. His works are clearer and more incisive than the writings of either Adam Smith, Ricardo, or John Stuart Mill. Mr. Cairnes, in his work on Political Economy Clearly Expounded, in discussing this very question, and the question that a high rate of wages means a low cost of product, says, in speaking of the United States:

How happens it then that, enjoying industrial advantages superior to other countries, they are yet unable to hold their own against them in the general markets of commerce?

This in substance, though not in form, is the identical question asked by the gentleman from Texas. I have given the answer of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Now hear the answer of the distinguished and eminent English free-trader. This is what Mr. Cairnes says is the answer:

What it means, and what it only can mean, is that they are unable to do so consistently with obtaining that rate of remuneration on their industry which is current in the United States. If only American laborers and capitalists would be content with the wages and profits current in Great Britain, there is nothing that I know of to prevent them from holding their own in any markets to which Manchester and Sheffield send their wares.

At last the cat is out of the bag. According to Mr. Cairnes—and he is an authority as great and as distinguished, let me say it with all due deference, in my opinion as the gentleman from Texas—according to Mr. Cairnes there is nothing to prevent us from holding our own in any market to which Manchester and Sheffield send their wares, provided our capitalists and laborers are content to take the wages and profits paid and received in Great Britain. Could this proposition be more tersely stated? It can be and it is more tersely stated by the same author in the same chapter. Speaking of the inability of America to compete with the pauper labor of Europe, he says:

They can not do so and at the same time secure the American rate of return on their work. The inability no doubt exists, but it is one created, not by the drawbacks, but by the exceptional advantages of their position. It is as if the skilled artisan should complain that he could not compete with the hedger and ditcher. Let him only be content with the hedger and ditcher's rate of pay and there will be nothing to prevent him from entering the lists, even against this rival.

Yes, indeed, the American workman can compete with the English workman if he will be content to take the English workman's pay, and the American capitalist and manufacturer can compete with the English capitalist and manufacturer if he will be content with the same profit that the Englishman realizes upon his investment. Here is the whole case in a nutshell. Pass this bill and the American workman will be compelled to compete with the English workman and receive the English workman's pay, or starve.

I fully appreciate the anxiety displayed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] when he discussed this phase of the question; and I am inclined to believe that he felt while he was discussing it that it was the rock upon which his scheme would be wrecked. The gentleman said, farther along in his argument, that our prosperity was due to the intelligence of our labor and the unrestricted movements of our exchanges among sixty millions of people at home. Again, he seems to have forgotten to state the reasons why our labor is intelligent, and why we have exchanges to move unrestrictedly among sixty millions of people. But I anticipate. I will discuss this phase of the question farther along. As bearing upon the question of the relative cost of production in England and the United States, let me quote for the edification and information of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] from a report made to the House of Commons on the condition of the mining district in 1854. Among other things the report says:

The large capitals of this country are the great instruments of warfare against the competing capital of foreign countries, and are the most essential instruments now remaining by which our manufacturing supremacy can be maintained.

Even as early as 1854 the statesmen of England became convinced that they could neither wheedle nor force other nations to adopt their free-

trade policy, so they admitted that their immense and colossal aggregations of capital were the great instruments of warfare against the competing capital of foreign countries. Please mark the word and heed it well—warfare. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] may now well understand why England can manufacture goods at a lower cost than the United States, and why it is vitally essential that American workmen should be protected, not only against the cheap labor of England, but also against its gigantic accumulations of cheap capital, which are used, as they themselves admit, to make war upon the industries of other nations. And shall other nations not protect themselves by measures sufficiently restrictive to at least counterbalance this warfare? Whenever revenue measures are discussed upon this floor the commercial policy of England is approvingly and ostentatiously paraded. Why?

Are we to adopt free trade because England has done so or because England wishes us to do so? What is the commercial policy of England? Before answering let us glance at some of the conditions which led to and aided in creating her present policy. Ninety-five per cent. of all the land in England is owned by less than 5 per cent. of the people. These land owners are mostly titled noblemen—lords, dukes, counts, and marquises. These lords of the land have converted the most fertile portions of England and Ireland into deer parks, pleasure parks, sheep walks, cattle ranches, drives, and lawns. The amount of land in England and Ireland withdrawn from agriculture and devoted to idle, non-productive, and useless purposes is simply enormous. Meanwhile the population of the kingdom steadily increased. The inevitable result followed. England could not feed her people with the productions of her own soil. Bread and meat had to be procured abroad; and when this condition of things was reached, when because of the dead weight of a useless and blighting landed aristocracy, population began to press upon subsistence, England was forced to abandon her protective policy, which for five hundred years had promoted and fostered her manufactures, and throw her ports open to the world, primarily in order to procure cheap breadstuffs. The corn laws which protected British agriculture were removed, because cheaper food became a vital necessity.

Nearly all the old restrictive or custom laws were repealed or greatly modified in order to induce, by the example, other countries to open their ports to British goods. To-day the settled policy of England is to have all the nations of the earth compete in her market for the sale of their raw material, so that through such competition she may be able to fix the price of what she wishes to buy; and in addition to that it is her policy to have all nations compete in her home market for her manufactured goods, to the end that through that competition she may be able to fix the price of what she has to sell, and thus become mistress not only of the seas, but of the industries and commerce of the globe. In pursuit of these aims and in establishing this policy England has been aggressive, unscrupulous, dishonest, and brutal. She laid a heavy hand upon the manufacturing industries of Ireland and they withered and perished from the face of the earth—labor became a drug in the labor market—the island being densely populated, the soil, the most productive in the world, was unable to feed the large extra manufacturing class that was thrown upon it—bad seasons and consequent failure of crops produced famines, and the people of Ireland melted away by starvation and expatriation almost as rapidly as the hosts of Sennacherib melted and withered before the breath of the angel of God. Six hundred and fifty years of the most barbarous cruelty and oppression, of bayonet rule, of rapine, plunder, bloodshed, and murder; six hundred and fifty years under the iron heel of the ruthless invader, under the domination of the most rigorous and prescriptive penal code ever known, at the mercy of incarnate brutality, under the shadow of the great robber nation of the world, and yet the spirit of the Irish people remained buoyant and unbroken.

But what all the engines of torture, the ingenuity of tyrants could devise, failed to do, the free-trade policy of England quickly accomplished, and poor, blasted, ruined, desolated Ireland weeps to-day, the Niobe of nations. What more? *Laissez faire, laissez passer* is inscribed upon the commercial banners of England; liberty for exchange, liberty for commerce, liberty for work, but no liberty for the human bodies she holds in hopeless bondage. *Laissez faire, laissez passer*—let us pass. Liberty for trade, and she blew Sepoys from the mouths of her cannon with as little compunction as the soldier discharges grape and canister at the advancing foe. Liberty for trade, and the Indian slave pays the transportation upon his raw cotton to England and the transportation upon the manufactured product when it is returned. "Liberty for commerce," she cried, while she forced the helot of Hindostan to eat unsalted, putrid fish because he was unable to pay the enhanced price of imported British salt, salt that he might have manufactured for a mere trifle at his own door. *Laissez passer*, and the shotted guns of England's war ships are turned upon the villages of the untutored, savage African, and the vilest, deadliest compounds, miscalled gin and rum, are forced upon these naked savages, and thus a deeper darkness throws a blacker shadow over the dark continent. *Laissez faire*, and the boom of England's cannon and the screech of bursting shells were heard in the ports and cities of China, and India's poisonous drug, the seductive opium, in the name of liberty, was forced down the throats of the resisting Chinese.

Let commerce be free—*laissez passer*—but in the early years of this century, when American ships were transporting the products of our country to French ports, our ships were seized, our citizens impressed, and our commerce destroyed by this same power that forever cries, "Liberty for trade, liberty for commerce." *Laissez passer*, and in the name of liberty for trade, this same robber nation passed up the Potomac and with a fiendish barbarity and unheard-of brutality sacked this city and applied the torch to this Capitol. This act of vandalism was perpetrated not eighteen hundred years before, but eighteen hundred years after the birth of Christ.

Laissez faire—liberty to work, to manufacture, but only for England, say her capitalists and manufacturers when they reduce prices and run their factories and works at a loss, as they have frequently done, in order to strangle and destroy the industries of other nations.

The war of 1812 closed our ports and forced us to manufacture goods we had previously imported. When peace was declared, England, in the name of liberty for trade and commerce, systematically began to cripple and strangle these new industries. In 1815, shortly after that war, Lord Brougham said:

It was well worth while to incur a loss on the exportation of English manufactures in order to stifle in the cradle the foreign [American] manufactures.

Laissez passer, let commerce pass, let it be free, said England, during the late war, when she built with her own money privateers, manned them with British crews, and, under the flag of the Confederate States, launched them upon our merchantmen and drove our commerce from the seas.

Laissez faire, indeed. Whenever any nation establishes a new industry or one that enters into competition with an established English industry, England will be on hand offering the same goods at cheaper prices.

Wherever God erects a house of prayer
The devil always builds a chapel there.

In every great crisis of our history as a people, whenever our liberties were endangered, whenever the existence of our institutions was jeopardized and the life of the Republic hung in the balance, let us not forget that England was and has been our most aggressive, active, dangerous, and deadly enemy. Her Canadian dependency is a menace to our prosperity and peace, and always will be so long as England's flag floats over that country. The military system of Canada is as perfect as British craft and experience can make it; nor should it be forgotten that the railway system of Canada, fostered and aided as it was and is by England, was projected as much with a view to future strategic military as present commercial purposes. A glance at any map of the United States and Canada will convince the casual observer of this fact. The vapid vaporings of the Anglomaniac about kinship of race, even if re-echoed in England, do not deceive the American patriot. Every thinking man knows that the ruling classes of England are hostile to this Republic—ever have been, always will be. The English press and English statesmen favor the bill now under discussion, and this in itself furnishes a reason, a very strong and cogent reason, why the American Representative should give it grave, thoughtful, and prayerful consideration before he decides to support it or vote for it.

Having glanced at the policy of England, let us turn our attention to our own country. What is, what ought to be our national policy? It seems to me that our policy should be to develop to the highest attainable limit, within our own boundaries, and as far as possible bring into proportionate and harmonious relation, the four great branches of industry—agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, and transportation.

No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
For the whole boundless continent is ours.

There are but few things which contribute to the happiness and comfort of man, and the creation and growth of great national life that can not be found in our mines or grown from our soil. Our climatology is as varied as the wants of man are diversified. There is no reason why we can not, if we so desire, become a distinct, independent people. It certainly ought to be our policy to create such industrial conditions, that if occasion demanded it, we could supply our people with every commodity in the whole range of human desires from within our own borders.

Why should we throw our markets open to the foreigner? It has cost us an incalculable amount of capital, an immeasurable aggregate of human exertion, besides great sacrifice of life, to transform the American forests and wilderness into the most opulent and powerful of nations and to maintain and preserve the most beneficent institutions known to man. And shall the alien and the enemy be given a share in the results of all our toil and effort without paying therefor a single cent? That would be to discriminate against our own citizens in favor of the foreigner. Nay, more; it would be permitting the alien, favored by cheap labor and cheap capital, and the industrial experience and development of six or seven centuries, to subject our people to the blighting competition these advantages would give him in our markets. This may be free trade, sugar-coated into "fair trade," but it is not fair treatment or fair play, nor is it common sense. Place upon the country, which by nature or adventitious circumstances is given special advantages over other countries in some particular line of trade or commerce, a restriction sufficient to counterbalance the

special advantage, and you simply follow the great law of human existence, self-preservation.

But the doctrine of protection is in theory as sound and tenable as it is in practice beneficial and salutary. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not take shelter behind the doctrines of List that there is a distinction between the theory of values and living forces—that is, between wealth and its causes; nor do I pin my faith to the distinction between cosmopolitan and national political economy. I do not look longingly forward to that visionary, mythical illusion, the millennium, to furnish me an excuse and pretext for being a free-trader. I am an advocate of the industrial protective system because I believe in it. Free-traders claim a preponderance of argument over protectionists in all discussions upon this question. This is often apparently true, but it is due to the misleading and imperfect way the protective idea or case is presented. The free-trader, to be at all successful in argument against the industrial protective system, must attack that system in detail; and if by joining issue on each particular customs duty he shows what appears to be an injustice against any particular class of citizens, he loudly proclaims the injustice of the whole system. This is neither fair nor honest discussion. The fact is, the protective system stands as a whole, and if it is to fall it must fall as a whole.

The strength of the system lies in its entirety—in its *ensemble* and completeness as a system. When the free-trade lawyer, for instance, claims he is unjustly taxed, for the benefit of others, on the clothing which he wears, he is attacking the system in detail, and makes an apparent case against it. But when it is remembered that the retainer of the lawyer and the fees of all professional men rise and fall as the rate of wages rises and falls, it will be seen that the protective system works no injustice to them, because under that system the rate of wages being higher, their fees are relatively and correspondingly higher, and their ability to pay slightly more for what they consume is thereby assured. The manufacturer of iron can not justly complain that his clothing is costing more than it would under the free-trade system, because the manufacturer of cloth could retort that he was paying relatively more for the iron and machinery he purchased. The farmer may say to the manufacturer that he is paying more for his agricultural implements and clothing than he would if foreign articles of the same kind were admitted free; but the manufacturer replies that the farmer has a home market created for him, and is paid more for the productions of the field than he would receive if he had to transport these commodities thousands of miles to some foreign market; so that, as Mr. Alby very pointedly puts it, we find that—

As we run successively the entire circle of industrial and agricultural production with each new industry that we take account of, the era of the apparent injustice will be continually narrowing till we end by finding ourselves in the presence of a series of people paying dearer for what they purchase, but making others pay dearer for what they sell.

This is the industrial protective system in its completeness as a whole, in its *ensemble*. It is a great patriotic national system of assurance against the unjust and ruinous competition of the pauper labor, cheap commodities, cheap capital, and cheap men of foreign countries. Man's power over matter is but imperfectly developed by perfection in any single industry. Agriculture subdues the earth in one direction only, and its highest degree of perfection depends upon the aid it can receive from the whole range of art and science. The degree and extent to which the people of any community can command the forces and services of nature indicates the degree of civilization attained by that community, and the extent to which a people have diversified their industries—the variety of their pursuits, gives the best test of their power to command the governing forces of matter.

The greater the diversification of industry in a State the greater is the degree of material progress and intellectual development attained by its people. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], in his remarks in presenting the bill under discussion, contended and insisted that the high rate of wages labor receives in the United States was not due to the tariff, but to labor-saving machinery, which vastly augmented the laborer's productive capacity. In his eager haste to score a point against the tariff, the gentleman admitted, unintentionally no doubt, the very converse of the proposition for which he was contending. Whence came this labor-saving machinery? What was it that stimulated the inventive genius of the country? Is it not a law universally recognized in economics that inventive genius is most active and efficient in that country where wages are highest? High wages then preceded invention and the highest types of labor-saving machinery and appliances, and high wages were the result of the tariff. Hence it will be seen that when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] claimed that high wages were the result of labor-saving machinery he was simply arguing in a circle. But let me quote an eminent and learned free-trader against the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Henry George, in an article on Chinese immigration, in one of our cyclopedias, says:

To apply to the machinery and industrial methods which are in one country (America) the outgrowth of high wages, the cheap labor which in the other country (China) destroys the incentive to improvement may for the time result in large profits to those who make the combination, but if the effect be ultimately to reduce the general rate of wages the result in that country is to check invention and lessen productive power.

Mr. George is an authority in the free-trade camp, and justly so for he is a close student and a deep thinker. He says the machinery and industrial methods of our country are the outgrowth of high wages. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] says the high wages are the outgrowth of the machinery and industrial methods. Both of these eminent economists belong to the same school; but then doctors will disagree. But there is in the extract quoted from Mr. George a suggestion which it would be well for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to take into prayerful consideration. If the effect of free trade will be to reduce the general rate of wages in this country—and there can be no doubt upon that point—the result, as Mr. George says, will be to check invention and lessen productive power. It seems, then, that wherever we find great diversity of industry we find a high state of normal progress in all the essentials of intellectual and national life, including active and effective inventive genius. Consequently, then, the degree of inventive genius found in a State indicates very clearly the general progress of that State.

Let us now apply the test of fact and see if this assertion can be proven. The report of the Patent Office for 1886 furnishes some very interesting data. During the year 1860 there were issued by the Patent Office 4,778 patents and reissues. This was 1 patent to each 6,580 of the population of the country. During the year 1870, notwithstanding the terrible war we had passed through, yet under the stimulating influences of the Morrill tariff the number of patents increased to 13,333, or 1 to every 2,891 of population. And during the last year, 1886, the number increased to 22,503, or 1 to every 2,665 of population upon a basis of 60,000,000. These figures demonstrate beyond question that a protective tariff stimulates and quickens invention, and the great apostle of free trade, Mr. George, is authority for the statement that active invention is the result of high wages, which statement, if true—and it unquestionably is—emphasizes and accentuates the proposition that a high rate of wages invariably results from a protective tariff.

It may be laid down as a general proposition which is susceptible of accurate demonstration that purely agricultural nations, or nations having but few manufacturing industries are invariably poor. Ireland and India are notable examples.

Do we want to be placed in this category? If so, we have only to adopt the free-trade policy of England. But are agricultural communities invariably poor? Let us see what the facts establish in our own country. Take the New England States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. These States have an area of only 66,465 square miles, but a population of 4,010,529, according to the census of 1880. The assessed value of the property of these States in 1880 was \$2,652,011,532, or \$660 per capita. Now let us turn our attention to the fourteen Southern States, including Missouri and West Virginia, which are not wholly agricultural.

These States have an area of 882,700 square miles, and in 1880 had a population of 14,425,723, and property assessed at \$2,370,923,269, or a per capita of but \$164. The contrast would be more striking still if those portions of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont which are purely agricultural were subtracted from the calculation. But let us pursue this inquiry a little further. The Middle States, including Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York, have an area of 116,460 square miles, and had, in 1880, a population of 11,578,549, and property assessed at \$5,564,578,488, or a per capita of \$480. The twenty-one Western States and Territories have an area of 1,883,975 square miles, and had in 1880 a population of 16,963,428, and property assessed at \$6,187,266,625, or a per capita of \$358. It must be remembered that the great manufacturing States of Ohio and Illinois and the semi-manufacturing State of Indiana aid in keeping up the per capita of wealth in the Western States. From these figures it is clearly seen that the States, like the New England and Middle States, which combine manufactures with agriculture, and in which the true patriotic American policy of bringing into harmonious and proportionate relation the four great branches of industry is pursued, are far more wealthy and prosperous than the States whose industry is confined almost exclusively to agriculture.

According to the census of 1880 Alabama had an estimated or actual per capita of \$299, North Carolina \$319, Wisconsin \$737, while Massachusetts had \$1,568, Pennsylvania \$1,259, New York \$1,499, and so on. These figures speak in thunder tones for the diversification of industry.

All human experience goes to show, and common sense would seem to indicate, that the farmer who has a home market, whose land is contiguous to the workshop and the factory prospers better and has a steadier and more stable market and receives larger prices than the farmer whose market is some thousand miles from the scene of his labors. The average wealth of the citizen of New England is four times as great as the citizen of the Southern States, while the citizen of the Middle States has a per capita wealth three times as large. This is wholly due to the manufacturing and greatly diversified industries of the New England and Middle States, and these industries have been created, brought into being, fostered, and promoted by the protective system, which this bill seeks to strangle and paralyze. To still further accentuate the striking difference between the States of but one industry and the States of many and varied industries, let us again look

at the report of the United States Patent Office. During the year 1886 there were issued to Massachusetts 2,116 patents, or one for every 842 of her population. During the same year there were issued to the people of Minnesota but 288 patents, or only one to every 2,711 of her population. The contrast between these two States is striking. It shows that there is three times more inventive activity and industrial progress in Massachusetts than there is in Minnesota. I do not wonder that the latter State has a united free-trade delegation upon this floor. Men are practically what their environment and conditions make them.

During 1886 there were issued to New York a patent to every 1,233 of her population; to Pennsylvania, 1 to every 1,871; to Ohio, 1 to every 2,000; to New Jersey, 1 to every 1,225; to Illinois, 1 to every 1,711; to Connecticut, 1 to every 729; to Rhode Island, 1 to every 1,101. These, with Massachusetts, are the great manufacturing States. Now look at the West and South: Missouri had issued in 1886, 1 to every 3,165; Wisconsin, 1 to every 3,305; Nebraska, 1 to every 3,453; Alabama, 1 to every 21,398; Texas, 1 to every 5,984; Georgia, 1 to every 11,015; South Carolina, 1 to every 21,640, and so on through the list. The average shows from five to fifteen times more inventive ability and industrial progress and activity in the manufacturing States than in those devoted almost entirely to agriculture. It is, perhaps, natural that the latter States will, upon this floor, vote almost solidly for this bill, while the progressive manufacturing States will vote almost solidly against it.

In view of these practical results from following a single industry, what becomes of the claim that free trade will make the United States wealthy and prosperous? It vanishes as do the theories of the college graduate after his mind has been sharpened by the friction of the realities of practical life. But what of the theory? If free trade will make this country wealthy, why not all countries? Other nations will not permit us to grow prosperous at their expense. If all nations had protective laws, commerce would exist under the conditions these laws made possible. Wipe out these laws everywhere—institute the reign of universal free trade—the conditions would immediately change, but when trade and commerce became adapted to the new conditions would the sum total of the wealth of the world be increased? Wealth is only created by labor, and to increase wealth the productive power of labor must be increased by opening up new fields for its activities and by the invention and use of better and more productive labor-saving appliances. Invention is stimulated by protective duties; new fields of labor are opened by them and by the diversification of industry; the results we have already seen.

That we should not collect more money than is needed for an honest and economical administration of the Government no one denies. There is no question here to discuss; but when economy is carried to a parsimonious policy of Government expenditure, there is an issue. In a country having no large standing army and an honest administration, as this country undoubtedly now has, a high rate of taxation does not in the least alarm me; for it will be found as a general rule that a highly civilized and progressive community can not exist, nor can a high and advanced degree of civilization be attained and maintained, without a comparatively high rate of taxation. And why should objection be made to taxing goods and products? All taxes are necessarily added to the cost of production and are of course paid by those who consume products, at least primarily, for it must not be forgotten that after the process of diffusion, percussion, and repercussion by which taxes reach and fasten upon all visible species of property has operated, yet after all it is the men who earn the money that goes into the Treasury who pay the taxes. That being true, does it make any difference to them how they pay them? Certainly not.

But the claim made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] is that they not only pay the taxes but a bounty to the American manufacturer as well. If this were true and there were no compensating advantages, I would not only retire from the field of discussion, but apologize for having appeared upon it.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] made the extraordinary and startling statement that the laborer has to work twice the number of days under the protective system to earn the price of a suit of clothes that he would have to work under the free-trade system. This is indeed important, if true. It is the old claim that the duty is added to the price of the home-made article. But is it true? It may be laid down as a general proposition that when home production is small and competition slight, much of the duty is paid by the consumer, but as home production increases and home competition becomes sharper, as it rapidly does under the stimulating effects of a fair tariff, the amount of the duty which the consumer pays steadily diminishes, and when the home supply equals or nearly equals the home demand, practically all of the duty is paid by the foreign manufacturer and importer. If the duty is added to the price of the protected article it is beyond controversy that the reduction or repeal of the duty will reduce the price of the home-made article by the amount of the duty removed.

Three times since the close of the late war duties have been decreased, but has there been cited a single instance of a corresponding decrease in the price of the home-made article? Advantage has not been taken of these opportunities to prove this reckless assertion. In 1879 American steel rails were worth in the American market \$40; the duty was

then \$28. If the theory of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] is sound, the repeal of the duty would have reduced the price of American steel rails to \$12 per ton, although at that time the same grade of steel rails could not be purchased in the English market for less than \$22 per ton. From 1846 to 1849 English iron sold in our market for \$40 per ton. It cost the American at that time \$60 per ton to produce like grade of iron. By 1851 the American furnaces were closed up and home competition no longer existed. The English iron immediately rose to \$80 per ton. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] seems to forget that even if this wild, reckless statement was based upon even the shadow of truth, the laborer would be in no way benefited by the removal of the duty, for as soon as the foreign manufacturer obtained control of the home market, prices, even if decreased, would be again advanced.

It is a fact, and I challenge contradiction, that hundreds of protected articles can be purchased in our retail stores for the same price that they can be purchased for in England.

It must have been such absurd and extravagant statements as these made by Mr. MILLS that induced the First Napoleon to say that "if an empire were made of adamant, political economy would grind it to powder." The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] also claimed that the manufacturer does not pay the workman a fair proportion of the margins which protection gives him. In many instances this is unfortunately too true. I meet the charge fairly and squarely. I would rather create and maintain an industrial condition which produces manufacturers—ay, monopolies and trusts, if you will—who have the ability to pay remunerative wages but who do not, than to create an industrial condition under which the manufacturer could not exist. In the latter case the laborer would starve. In the former case he can oppose combination by combination and fight industrial trusts with labor trusts. These combinations which so alarm my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] have no terrors for me. The giant Cyclops, competition, will take care of the trusts. When profits become excessive or phenomenal in any line, outside capital will immediately rush in and it will be trust eat trust.

Even if outside capital does not rush in, excessive profits will cause a trust to fall to pieces of its own weight. The Knights of Labor organization is a vast labor trust, and this trust, with other labor trusts, will be able to prevent the industrial trusts from insisting upon unjust exactions. But right here I am reminded that the protective system is charged with the creation of these industrial trusts, another reckless assertion. The greatest of all trusts—in fact, the parent trust, the Standard Oil Company—does not owe its existence to the tariff; neither does the whisky trust, for whose welfare the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] is so very solicitous. Trusts are the result of social forces now operating in all industrial countries, whether under the protective or free-trade policy. They are simply one of the many phases which the evolutions of mankind present. Should they abuse the patience of the people to the extent my friend fears, it will certainly be bad for the trusts. There is a higher law than a written constitution, and it is sometimes evoked.

But again it is said the protective system produces tramps, that the country is swarming with idle, unemployed men, and that the tariff is responsible for this condition of things—another absurdity. If free-trade England is more prosperous than we are why are English laborers and mechanics constantly fleeing from that country and flocking to our shores? Since 1873 there have landed upon our shores 169,000 adult Englishmen, seeking better wages and better environment, and this immigration is increasing, not diminishing. There are almost as many Canadians in the United States as there are in Canada. The Dominion has encouraged immigration in many ways, but immigrants will not bide with her; they almost invariably find their way to this tax-cursed, tramp-inflicted land of ours. Mr. F. B. Sanborn, an eminent American publicist, says it costs the United States less than 50 cents per capita to care for our paupers, while it costs England \$1.50 per capita, or three times as much. At the last official enumeration there were 1,017,000 paupers in the United Kingdom, 803,000 of whom were in England, 115,000 in Ireland, and 99,000 in Scotland.

France has a larger population than England, but has only 417,000 paupers. England is a free-trade country; the United States and France are not, yet England has three times as many paupers as France or the United States. How these base charges melt away when the light of truth is turned upon them. But let us be honest to our convictions of truth. Paupers and tramps would exist no matter under what policy the world's industries and commerce were carried on—to a much less extent under the protective system, as the facts show; but still they would exist, always will exist while human selfishness is the dominant factor of social progress. Their very existence is an ever present, eternal protest against that universal selfishness upon which the whole fabric of our civilization is based and buttressed. Ambition and selfishness have been the main springs of human activity, but the time is at hand when the good that these human impulses accomplish will have to be separated from the evil that necessarily accompanies them. Great material progress is commendable, but our ultimate aim must be higher. A progress along the line of matter becomes a curse and an evil unless along the same line there is a progress of soul.

Man is progressing along this line, too, but he advances slowly and moves on a calvary highway, but by his sufferings he is exhausting and consuming the evil of his environment. Great philosophic truths do not become popular as soon as discovered; they must be first humanized by suffering souls or so translated by some inspired genius that the multitude can understand them. The proposition that the reign of law and order and the security of life and property is best subserved by a juster and more equitable distribution of the productions of labor than now pertains ought to be regarded and acted upon as a great economic truth, but unfortunately it is not. We have not yet fully emerged from those social conditions which prompted Hobbes to say *homo homini lupus*; but who will undertake to say that the time is not fast approaching when man will find pleasure in being humane even to the wolf—*homo lupu homo*.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB] has called attention to the importation of pauper labor by capitalists and manufacturers. That was done, but I fail to see how the heartless cupidity and cruelty of these followers of Hobbes can be charged against the tariff. Let me vouchsafe to my friend some information of which he is perhaps not aware. When in the Forty-eighth Congress I was presenting to this House the merits of a bill which I had reported from the Committee on Labor, preventing the importation of pauper labor under contract, the word "demagogue" ever and anon floated to my ears in muttered whispers; and it was uttered and launched upon this not ambient but vapor-laden air by gentlemen who are now advocating and supporting the bill under discussion; and whatever opposition that measure received came from friends of the Mills bill. It came from gentlemen whose knowledge of the great labor problem was derived from tableaux and object lessons. Ring up the curtain. Behold the lights of other days, free-trade days; at the front of the stage an uncovered pine table, upon which is a lighted tallow candle, and farther back, in the shade, is a black man couchant and a white man and a rawhide rampart.

I do not say these things in bitterness; I only refer to them to show how very difficult it is to break away from the prejudices that are born with us, or to break through the environment of conditions that have influenced most of our lives. One of the greatest evils the curse of slavery brought upon our kinsmen of the South was the creation of a caste, because it has outlived all the other evils which flowed from this Pandora box. There is no despotism so cruel and harsh as the despotism of caste. It is supersensitive to any intrusion into its fancied realm, and anything whose tendency is to ennoble and elevate human dignity and independence always encounters its fiercest hostility. The caste of the South, by example and propinquity, caused and stimulated the birth of a Northern caste, which because of its lack of age and the fact that it is largely composed of parvenues and illiterate boors, who in many instances are the creation of fortuitous circumstances, is a hundred times more despotic and exacting than the Southern caste, which has the advantage of age, culture, manners, and refinement.

It is the castes who have created the new gospel which claims for the benefit of society the divine right of selfishness, and offers up with sardonic glee the poverty of the poor as an inevitable sacrifice to the Moloch of greed and competition.

It is the castes and the consuming desire to enter their charmed circle that has created and produced paupers and tramps in this country, as in England their presence is largely accounted for by the oppressions of the aristocracy. It is the reign of caste and the gross and brutal selfishness it creates that compels us to admit that, although the slave is no longer in the South or beneath us, yet he is among us. The barbarian is no longer away out upon the horizon of our vision; he is by our side. The shackles are laid away in the museum of the Limbo of the past, yet in reality slavery still abides with us. But these things do not deter me from looking hopefully to the future. The test of every system, political, religious, or economical, is the man it produces; and I know the protective system has produced better men and more of them for America than the free-trade system. The protective system gave the mechanics of the North better wages, more leisure, better schools, more of all the essentials of civilized life, and the result is that we frequently see mechanics and laborers, the sons of the humble and lowly poor, grow steadily in mental strength and vigor until, by their own exertions and the benefits derived from diversified industrial conditions, they become intellectual giants and suddenly burst through the fetters caste riveted upon them—burst through the disadvantages surrounding their lowly lives, and "flame like stars in the forehead of the morning sky."

The pauper question has led me into this digression, but before I leave the subject let me say a few words, not warningly, but rather advisory, to the people who live in the realm of caste. It must be always borne in mind that until the laws governing the distribution of wealth are changed, the great majority in every State must necessarily be comparatively ignorant, poor, and dependent, with but very little interest in the preservation of law, order, and government. It therefore follows as an inevitable sequence that the State is at the mercy of any accident or concatenation of circumstances which unchains the pent up passions of the multitude and lets slip the dogs of mobocracy; and if in such emergency law and order is overthrown, let us not forget that the catastrophe will be due to the harsh and cruel conditions

which the castes blindly created for the State's existence. Society sometimes dances the stately minuet or the ravishing valse on the lava floor of a crater, unmindful of the fact that the volcano beneath slumbers only, and is not extinct or dead. Let every man do unto others as he would others should do unto him, and these evils will be averted, and tramps and paupers will exist in history only.

But to the point. Every gentleman who has spoken in favor of this bill has complained of the dearth of American goods. Cheapness, then, is the great desideratum to be attained. If I could I would expurgate the word "cheap" from all living languages. I hate it, and hate all inanimate cheap things as thoroughly as I despise cheap men.

It is said protection discriminates against the consumer in favor of the producer. If there be consumers who are not producers, it would be good policy to discriminate them out of existence. The citizen who consumes but does not produce is a curse to the community in which he lives; his sole purpose in life, the object of his existence, is to eat up the results of the producer's labor. This consumer, who is not a producer, can have no interest in the State, no interest in the welfare of his fellow beings, no interest in anything except to minimize the cost of all things which he consumes; cheapness is to him the sum of all earthly happiness. To have cheap sugar he would grind the negroes of Cuba and Louisiana into sirup; to have cheap provisions he would make the farmer a serf; to have cheap clothing he would pauperize and brutalize the laborers and mechanics of the country.

Low wages sends the pregnant mother into the factory and stamps upon her offspring the mark of premature age; low wages sends children into the shop, and dwarfs them physically and mentally; low wages prevents marriage and increases bastardy; low wages fills the brothel as well as the jail. Angels weep, while hell gapes and yawns, and demons dance and howl when Ricardo's low natural wage limit is reached, as it is, alas! too frequently in this country, but not because we have a tariff, but because of man's inhumanity and brutality to his fellows.

Cheap goods mean cheap labor, cheap labor means cheap men, cheap men mean poverty, ignorance, vice, brutality, and barbarism. Man's value to himself, to his family, to the state, is governed by his wages; his soul, his spirit rises as his wages advance—falls as his wages decline. Destroy a man's wages and you destroy the man. Destroy the high rate of wages paid American workmen and our industries and liberties would be jeopardized. Do the advocates of this bill desire an era of general cheapness at this tremendous sacrifice? If they do their advocacy has wisdom and method in it.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have reached a phase of this discussion which I would fain pass over in silence, but the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] will not have it so. He has proclaimed to the world, upon this floor and through the press, that this revenue bill involves Democratic principles and Democratic duty. In a letter written by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to the Iroquois Club of Chicago, the Cobden Club of America, he very clearly and emphatically declares that the Democratic party is not only pledged to the support of the policy involved in this bill, but that the coming Presidential campaign is to be contested upon the lines laid down in this measure. Against this assumption upon the part of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] I, as a Democrat, here and now enter my most solemn protest. In the letter referred to Mr. MILLS says:

Our President has boldly plated the colors on the field, and challenged our opponents to try results with us upon issue presented.

The President in his message to this Congress indicated most clearly that in his opinion the reduction of taxation, necessarto wipe out the surplus and prevent its further accumulation should be made wholly from customs duties, and that the internal-revenue system of taxation should not be disturbed. My political reading and education lead me to believe that the policy of the Democratic party in the past, and in the present, was and is hostile to an internal-revenue system of taxation.

Mr. Jefferson denounced this system more than eighty years ago. That great statesman said that this system of taxation covered our land with officers, opened our doors to their intrusions and domiciliary vexation. Samuel J. Tilden more than twenty years ago also denounced in unmistakable terms the system of internal-revenue taxation. I always supposed that Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Tilden were prophets in the Democratic party, whose utterances could be relied upon as enunciating principles of the Democracy in all their purity. If we are to take the utterances of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] for granted, we must take the position that free trade is a cardinal principle of the Democracy. I, for one, will not be driven into any such false and ridiculous attitude. Mr. Jefferson, in his sixth annual message to Congress, nearly ninety years ago, pointedly and interrogatively said:

Shall we suppress the impost and give the advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?

Later on, in 1816, the father, not only of the Declaration of Independence, but the father and founder of the Democratic party, Mr. Jefferson, said:

Experience has taught me that manufactures are as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.

The messages of Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe fairly bristled with

declarations and recommendations in favor of protecting American manufactures and American industries. In those early days our tariff laws were protective in character, and strange enough one of these laws protected and fostered into existence the immense cotton industry of the South.

The question never took a political shape until 1832. South Carolina, under the leadership of Senator Hayne and Mr. Calhoun, about this time discovered that free trade would be of more advantage to the South than protection. Senator Hayne perhaps accurately described the situation when he said, in 1832:

We can not manufacture except as to a few coarse articles. Slave labor is utterly incapable of being successfully applied to such an object. Slaves are too improvident and incapable of that minute, constant, delicate attention and that persevering industry which are essential to the success of manufacturing establishments.

The fact is the South, because of the curse of slave labor, found herself at a disadvantage, as compared with the North, in diversified industrial pursuits. Slave labor was adapted to only one industry, agriculture, and that being the case it was of course to the advantage of the South, at least for the time being, to purchase those manufactured goods she needed in the cheapest market she could obtain, while she sold her staple products in the highest market she could obtain. It will therefore be seen that the free-trade sentiment in this country was the outgrowth of peculiar conditions and peculiar environment, and perhaps nowhere in the history of the world is the tenacity of prejudice more strongly exemplified than in the fact that this sentiment continues a quarter of a century after the conditions and environment which gave it birth have passed away and no longer exist. Many gentlemen upon this floor can not help being free-traders. They were born so. It is rather the result of congenital causes than conviction based upon research and investigation.

Prior to the first election of General Jackson, local sectional feeling, especially in the South, became quite bitter upon this subject. In his first message to Congress, President Jackson used these words:

In deliberating therefore, on these interesting subjects, local feeling and prejudices should be merged in the patriotic determination to promote the great interest of the whole. All attempts to connect them with the party conflicts of the day are unnecessarily injurious and should be discountenanced.

Thus spoke President Jackson in relation to tariff legislation and the tariff in December, 1829. That President Jackson was a protectionist is clearly revealed in his messages, and especially in a letter written to Dr. Coleman, in which he says:

The American farmer has neither a foreign nor a home market, except for cotton. Does not this clearly prove that there is too much labor employed in agriculture, and that the channels of labor should be multiplied? Common sense points out at once the remedy.

It seems to me that it would be well for those who are now endeavoring to apotheosize this bill, and who proclaim that it involves Democratic principle and duty, to occasionally refer to the teachings of the founders and fathers of the Democratic party. It would be especially well for them to heed the warning advice of President Jackson, that—

All attempts to connect customs-revenue legislation with the party conflicts of the day are necessarily injurious and should be discountenanced.

I am well aware that about 1830 both parties began to trim somewhat upon this question. Even so great a protectionist as Henry Clay, who would "rather be right than be President," was in favor of a compromise upon the question of the tariff. Mr. Clay, as well as Mr. Jackson, wanted to be President, and, as Mr. Thompson very tersely puts it—

The concealed magnet in the White House often makes the most honest compass deflect from the North Star of principle.

The electoral vote of the Southern States was a stake for which many good men sacrificed both honor and principle; and from the time of Van Buren to that of Buchanan the Democratic party in its onward march sometimes obliquely toward the side of free trade. Since the close of the war a school of Democrats, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] is a conspicuous example, have been endeavoring to lead the party back to the principles that controlled it from Jefferson to Van Buren, a period which covered over forty years. This school of thought prevailed in 1884, as the plank in the Chicago platform upon which Mr. Cleveland was elected demonstrates.

The tariff plank in the Chicago platform clearly suggests, if it does not positively declare, that the necessary reduction of revenue to prevent the accumulation of a surplus, should be made along the line of internal-revenue taxation. It certainly does not justify, in the light of any possible construction, the claim that this reduction must be made entirely from customs duties.

It is clear and emphatic that the necessary reduction in taxation can be effected, and it declares that it must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability of competing successfully with foreign labor; and it further declares that as high rates of duties shall be levied as will be necessary to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the high rate of wages prevailing in this country. I know it has been said by advocates of the present bill that the Chicago platform was considerable of a fraud. Gentlemen who make this declaration seem to forget that if it is true, the present Administration was elected by fraud. In 1884, when I advocated the election of President Cleveland, I believed that my party, through the

Chicago convention, proclaimed honestly its views upon the tariff question. I did not then, nor did any other speaker or newspaper, say to the people of this country, "This platform is a fraud; we do not mean what we here say about the tariff. Although we here proclaim that the surplus can be reduced by the reduction of internal-revenue taxation, and that American industries must be fostered and protected, we do not mean that, but the very converse of the proposition."

If the Democratic leaders took that stand, if the Democratic party in 1884 appealed to the people in that way, Mr. Blaine would now be occupying the White House instead of Grover Cleveland.

I have no objection to any gentleman entertaining upon this great economic question any views which his judgment dictates, but I do protest now, and will protest at all times and upon all occasions, against the false assumption and suicidal declaration that this so-called "Mills bill" involves a Democratic principle or a Democratic duty. As a measure for reducing the surplus and preventing a still further accumulation of surplus, it will, if passed, in my judgment, prove an abortive failure. I therefore oppose it for that reason as well as those already given. As a measure, as it now stands and as it is here presented, enunciating Democratic principles and Democratic faith, I not only condemn it, I repudiate and denounce it. I have heard gentlemen upon this floor tear a passion to tatters and declare in impassioned speech that they would vote for this bill, not because it was a just or wise measure, but because they were Democrats. I believe in Democracy, but there is no Democracy in this bill. I know of but one guide by which to shape my official as well as my private conduct, and that is the light which comes from my inner, moral consciousness—by this light my convictions of right and duty are formed; and if the time should ever come when party or any other kind of prejudice becomes stronger than my judgment, and I find that the courage of my convictions is departing from me, I will be ready to exclaim with Brutus in honest candor and sincerity—

Be ready, gods, with all your thunderbolts
Dash me to pieces.

A brief summary of the history of our industrial legislation and policy may not be out of place here. We had no manufactures before the Revolution. That war forced the people to manufacture articles of necessity at least. But after peace was declared in 1783 the country was flooded by English goods. England had the factories, the machinery, the skilled labor, and our infant industries were crushed and ruined in a short time. The old articles of confederation created a government too feeble and weak to remedy this and other evils, hence the Constitutional Convention and the Constitution, which owed its existence to commercial necessity more than to any other cause. The power to regulate foreign and domestic commerce which is clearly vested in the Constitution did not exist in the articles of federation, but was a power claimed and exercised by each State. The first Congress was literally besieged with petitions from the business men of the country praying for protection against the absolute ruin which the competition of the foreign manufacturer and trader had brought upon the country. The first tariff law was passed and signed July 4, 1789. It imposed "duties on goods, wares, and merchandise imported." This tariff was very low. January, 1790, Washington recommended to the adjourned session of the First Congress a protective policy, and a bill was passed August, 1790, really protective in character.

Strangely enough raw cotton was one of the first industries specially protected at this period—3 cents per pound or 10 per cent. of its value. This protected the South against India. In 1794 Whitney's cotton gin put the South ahead of competition and outside of the need of protection. The war of 1812 found the country still wholly unprepared for such an emergency. The country could not even make a blanket. The limited protection afforded was not sufficient to promote woolen or iron industries, and others of a like character, to render the country independent of foreign markets.

Up to 1824 the tariff laws, though protection in character, were inadequate to protect the industries of the country from the supremacy of foreign manufactures.

It was the policy of England then to keep this country in the position of colonial dependence. That is her policy to-day, and free trade would render us simply the producers of food and raw material for England.

In 1823 President Monroe for the second time urged the adoption of a higher tariff. The following January a new bill was reported. This was the first real protective tariff. Under it the country prospered as it had never prospered before.

In 1833 the tariff was modified by a gradual 20 per cent. reduction, which was to take full effect in June, 1842. This increased imports 75 per cent. The gradual reduction went on, and shops and factories closed up and disappeared as the reduction went into effect, until in 1837 the crash came—banks closed, and the country verged upon the point of bankruptcy. The imports fell away because the people were too poor to buy, and the Government had to borrow money to meet its ordinary expenses. The cry, "Work! give me work!" was heard everywhere in the land.

In 1840 the country was so thoroughly aroused that the Democratic party was defeated, and General Harrison, a protectionist President, was elected. The tariff of 1842 was still more protective than the one of 1823-'24 to 1828. Even the South did not now object, for it had been

demonstrated that free trade was not the unmixed blessing it was claimed to be.

Next came the tariff of 1846. It was, strictly speaking, an ad valorem tariff, and therefore vicious, for ad valorem duties make the home market far more dependent upon the fluctuations of the foreign market, besides being more liable to permit and allow frauds and encourage perjury. The tariff of 1846 did not materially change the tariff of 1842 except by the adoption of vicious ad valorem methods.

This ad valorem tariff of 1846 lasted until 1857, to the ruin of many industries. In 1857 duties were reduced 25 per cent.; another great panic—collapse and ruin followed.

In 1860 the Republican party, with protection as one of its cardinal principles, carried the country, and for the third time Democratic supremacy was broken. We have changed our financial policy nine times in one hundred years, seduced always from protection to free trade by the seductive voice of theorists, but in every instance driven by hard and bitter experience back to protection. Are we going to repeat the experience once more? I ask again, are we going to be seduced from duty only to be driven back again? Will we ever learn anything? It might perhaps, taking an optimistic view of the matter, be well to try the free-trade experiment again, for the terrible lesson it would teach us would certainly settle the question for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, that great *doctrinaire* and apostle of free trade, Robert J. Walker, in a report as Secretary of the Treasury in 1845, speaking of commerce and exchanges, said: "Let them alone." Those of our people who have followed this advice are surrounded by commercial inanition and industrial asphyxiation. This is an age of ideas, of thought, of active, rapid flight of mind onward, ever onward and upward; our faces are toward the noon-day sun of science, and the "Let them alone" dictum is far behind us. We let nothing alone. We recognize that mental activity is the supreme law of human destiny, and that the kingdom of matter must be conquered and subdued by the empire of mind; we push incessantly onward on the mighty track-way of civilization; we pierce the mountain-side; we span the river and the valley for iron roads on which trade and commerce forever flow; we organize the capital, the thought, the energies and activities of our people; we go down into the bowels of the earth, into the very arcana of nature, and tear out the heart of her mystery; we control and utilize the air, penetrate and investigate the secrets of the upper atmosphere and hoary ocean's awful depths; we touch every known element of nature with the deft fingers of art and the all-powerful hand of science; we apply to them living forces, the cunning but mighty hand of intellectualized labor, and change, transform, and transmute them into objects of use and beauty, to minister to our bodily wants and esthetical desires; we touch dull, inert matter with the wand of industrial genius, and sentient forces appear and become the slaves of our will; the electricity, which for cycles and ages only flashed its red glare in advance of the bellowing thunder, we have harnessed to the car of progress and utilized in an hundred ways to enhance the comforts and increase the potential possibilities of humanity; with it we annihilate time and space, propel machinery, decompose elements, chase away darkness, and send the human voice along the pulsing wires to points a thousand miles away. All this and vastly more have we accomplished, not by letting force and matter alone, but by applying to them the crystallizations of thought that we have inherited from the centuries of progress and human evolution that have gone before. [Great applause.]

Patents issued to citizens of the United States, with the ratio of population to each patent granted.

States and Territories.	Patents and designs.	One to every—
Alabama.....	59	21,398
Arizona Territory.....	13	3,110
Arkansas.....	61	13,155
California.....	524	1,650
Colorado.....	111	1,750
Connecticut.....	854	729
Dakota Territory.....	60	2,252
Delaware.....	42	3,490
District of Columbia.....	201	881
Florida.....	41	6,573
Georgia.....	140	11,015
Idaho Territory.....	6	5,435
Illinois.....	1,798	1,711
Indian Territory.....	2	
Indiana.....	699	2,830
Iowa.....	452	3,594
Kansas.....	283	3,519
Kentucky.....	251	6,568
Louisiana.....	95	9,894
Maine.....	138	4,702
Maryland.....	270	3,462
Massachusetts.....	2,116	842
Michigan.....	768	2,131
Minnesota.....	288	2,711
Mississippi.....	52	21,761
Missouri.....	685	3,165
Montana Territory.....	24	1,631
Nebraska.....	131	3,453
Nevada.....	14	4,447
New Hampshire.....	157	2,210
New Jersey.....	923	1,225

Patents issued to citizens of the United States, etc.—Continued.

States and Territories,	Patents and designs.	One to every—
New Mexico Territory.....	12	9,963
New York.....	4,121	1,233
North Carolina.....	75	18,663
Ohio.....	1,559	2,000
Oregon.....	60	2,912
Pennsylvania.....	2,289	1,871
Rhode Island.....	251	1,101
South Carolina.....	46	21,640
Tennessee.....	136	11,340
Texas.....	266	5,984
Utah Territory.....	24	5,998
Vermont.....	117	2,840
Virginia.....	122	12,398
Washington Territory.....	32	2,347
West Virginia.....	83	7,451
Wisconsin.....	398	3,305
Wyoming Territory.....	8	2,598
United States Army.....	3	
United States Navy.....	3	
Total.....	20,903	

Patents issued to citizens of foreign countries.

Of patents issued to foreigners, there were granted to citizens of—

Algeria.....	1	Japan.....	1
Argentina Republic.....	1	Monaco.....	1
Australia.....	2	Mexico.....	6
Austria-Hungary.....	47	Netherlands.....	2
Belgium.....	17	Newfoundland.....	2
Brazil.....	2	New South Wales.....	4
British Guiana.....	1	New Zealand.....	6
Canada.....	275	Norway.....	4
Cape of Good Hope.....	1	Roumania.....	1
Central America.....	7	Russia.....	8
Corea.....	1	Scotland.....	36
Cuba.....	4	South Australia.....	3
Denmark.....	9	Spain.....	4
England.....	548	Sweden.....	18
France.....	144	Switzerland.....	34
Germany.....	272	Victoria.....	5
Hawaii.....	5	West Indies.....	1
India.....	1		
Ireland.....	9	Total.....	1,489
Italy.....	6		

Comparative statement of the business of the office from 1837 to 1886, inclusive.

Year.	Applications.	Carets filed.	Patents and reissues.	Cash received.	Cash expended.	Surplus.
1837.....			435	\$29,289.08	\$33,506.98	
1838.....			520	42,123.54	37,402.10	\$4,721.44
1839.....			425	37,260.00	34,543.51	2,716.49
1840.....	735	228	473	38,066.51	39,020.67	
1841.....	847	312	495	40,413.01	52,668.87	
1842.....	761	391	517	35,505.68	31,241.48	5,264.20
1843.....	819	315	510	35,315.81	30,776.96	4,538.85
1844.....	1,045	380	495	42,509.26	36,244.73	6,264.53
1845.....	1,246	452	504	51,076.14	39,395.05	11,680.49
1846.....	1,272	448	638	50,264.16	46,158.71	4,105.45
1847.....	1,531	553	559	63,111.19	41,573.35	21,537.84
1848.....	1,628	607	652	67,576.69	58,905.84	8,670.85
1849.....	1,955	595	1,068	80,752.98	77,716.44	3,036.54
1850.....	2,193	662	968	86,927.05	80,100.95	6,816.10
1851.....	2,258	760	872	95,738.61	86,916.93	8,821.68
1852.....	2,639	966	1,019	112,656.34	95,916.91	16,739.43
1853.....	2,673	901	961	121,527.45	132,869.83	
1854.....	3,328	868	1,844	163,789.84	167,146.32	
1855.....	4,435	906	2,012	216,439.35	179,540.33	36,919.02
1856.....	4,960	1,024	2,506	192,588.02	190,931.02	
1857.....	4,771	1,010	2,896	196,132.01	211,882.09	
1858.....	5,364	964	3,695	203,716.16	193,193.74	10,522.42
1859.....	6,225	1,097	4,505	245,942.15	210,278.41	35,663.74
1860.....	7,653	1,084	4,778	256,352.59	252,820.80	3,531.79
1861.....	6,643	700	3,329	187,354.44	221,491.91	
1862.....	5,083	824	3,532	215,754.99	182,810.39	32,944.60
1863.....	6,014	787	4,184	195,593.29	189,414.14	6,179.15
1864.....	6,932	1,063	5,025	240,919.98	229,868.00	11,051.98
1865.....	10,664	1,937	6,616	348,791.84	274,199.34	74,592.50
1866.....	15,269	2,723	9,458	495,665.38	361,724.28	133,941.10
1867.....	21,276	3,597	13,026	646,581.92	639,263.32	7,318.60
1868.....	20,420	3,705	13,410	681,505.86	628,679.77	52,826.09
1869.....	19,271	3,624	13,997	693,145.81	609,430.78	206,715.03
1870.....	19,171	3,273	13,333	669,456.76	557,149.19	112,307.57
1871.....	19,472	3,365	13,056	678,716.46	560,505.08	118,212.38
1872.....	18,246	3,090	13,613	699,725.39	665,591.36	34,135.03
1873.....	20,414	3,248	12,864	703,191.77	691,178.98	12,012.79
1874.....	21,602	3,181	13,599	738,278.17	679,288.41	58,989.76
1875.....	21,638	3,094	14,837	743,453.33	721,657.71	21,795.65
1876.....	21,425	2,697	15,595	757,987.65	652,542.00	105,445.65
1877.....	20,308	2,809	14,187	732,342.85	613,152.62	119,190.23
1878.....	20,260	2,755	13,444	725,375.55	593,082.89	132,292.66
1879.....	20,059	2,620	13,213	703,931.47	529,968.97	174,292.50
1880.....	23,012	2,490	13,947	749,685.32	538,865.17	210,820.15
1881.....	26,059	2,406	16,584	853,665.89	605,173.28	248,492.61
1882.....	31,522	2,553	19,267	1,009,219.45	683,867.67	325,351.78
1883.....	35,577	2,741	22,383	1,146,240.00	675,234.86	471,005.14
1884.....	35,600	2,582	20,413	1,075,798.80	970,579.76	105,219.04
1885.....	35,717	2,552	24,233	1,188,098.15	1,024,378.85	163,719.30
1886.....	35,968	2,513	22,508	1,154,551.40	992,503.40	162,047.95

Before the conclusion of Mr. FORAN's remarks the hour expired, and On motion of Mr. SOWDEN, by unanimous consent, his time was extended to complete his speech.

Mr. O'FERRALL was recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. O'FERRALL] to yield me three minutes.

Mr. O'FERRALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman who has just preceded me [Mr. FORAN]. I did not desire to interrupt him in his argument, but he has made two or three positive statements, and if those statements can be successfully contradicted it is perhaps well that the contradiction should go forth to the country with his speech.

He has said here, sir, that he was opposed to everything cheap. I ask him if the records of the manufacturing industries of this country and of the world for the past thirty years do not show that while the prices of commodities have depreciated from 25 to 50 per cent., the price of labor has gradually and steadily increased throughout Europe from 50 to 80 per cent.? I ask him, sir, if it is not true that under the protected industries of this country the census of 1850 shows the average percentage paid labor to the cost of the article produced in this country, was 23.3 per cent.; that under the census of 1860 it had fallen to 21.2 per cent.; that in 1870 it had fallen to 18 per cent., and that in 1880 it had fallen to 17.8 per cent.; while to-day in England the average amount labor receives to the value of the article produced is from 30 to 32 per cent.? I ask the gentleman to explain these facts, and further to explain why it is that the American wage-worker's percentage of earnings to the value of articles produced has steadily, steadily, steadily depreciated, while the prices of all commodities in the United States are higher than in any other country in the world, and who is it that is receiving the difference in cost and labor? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] did not hear the whole of my speech. When he reads the whole of it, as I hope he will, he will find all his questions fully answered.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Mr. Chairman, for four sessions of Congress I have sat on this floor and listened to the speeches which have been made upon the great and now absorbing issue of the tariff. For four sessions I have remained an attentive listener to all that has been said by the advocates of a tariff for protection and the advocates of a tariff for revenue, and have not opened my lips, except indirectly in advocacy of the doctrine of either school.

The time has come, however, when my sense of duty to the people whom I have the distinguished honor to represent in this branch of the legislative department of this Government impels me to speak, and in speaking, though my words may be simple and unadorned, they will be the words of candor and soberness. I have just listened with pleasure to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FORAN], but in my remarks I shall endeavor to be more practical and not so theoretical.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the farming and laboring classes of this country have never been brought to a full understanding of this question. The voice of the advocate of monopolies has been raised in every nook and corner, and his "league tracts" scattered as thick as autumn leaves in the highways and byways. Yet the advocate of the farmer and wage-worker has to a great extent bridled his tongue and curbed his pen.

Industriously indeed have the advocates of a protective tariff sought to impress the public mind with the belief that the tariff is a subject so difficult and intricate that only the most enlightened, those versed in statecraft and studying mighty governmental problems by the flickering light of the midnight lamp, could understand it, while the advocates of a tariff for revenue have failed to present and drive home the plain truth and immutable fact that a tariff is a tax, and the heavier the tariff the heavier the tax, and that the man who buys any manufactured article, from a knitting-needle to a thrashing-machine, a horse-shoe to a ton of iron, a spool of thread to a silk dress, a pair of socks to a suit of clothes, a mustard plaster to a pound of morphine, whether manufactured in any foreign country or this country, pays this tax either into the Treasury of the Government, if he buys the foreign-made article, or the pocket of the manufacturer, if he buys the home-made article.

The advocates of a protective tariff with lusty lungs have sung the song of "Protection! protection!" to the farmer and laboring man, while the advocates of a tariff for revenue have failed to respond with the cry of "Oppression and robbery!"

It is high time, sir, those who stand in the position of representatives of the great mass of people of this land who earn their living in the furrow or at the bench, at the anvil or in the workshops, with the spade or with the hod, in the glowing light of the furnace or in the dingy darkness of the mines, by the music of the spindle and the loom, and by the many other avocations which fill the avenues of industry, should be awakening to the importance of the high duties devolved upon them, and no longer sleep at their posts when the wolf of protection is daily crying around the doors of the homes which they represent.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that so far as the Representatives on this floor

from the Southern States are concerned there is some excuse for their past lethargy in this respect.

Mighty issues for years crowded upon them, which affected the very civilization of their States, and their minds were absorbed by questions whose importance was felt in the very marrow of their bones.

But the dangers which threatened have fortunately been dispelled, and lowering clouds have given way to bright sunshine; the sheen of Democracy has illumined the way, and each State in this Union of States stands out in the light of the Constitution as coequal and co-ordinate, and Southern Representatives can now direct their energies along with brethren of the North of the same political faith in correcting the crying evils of a system which is daily drawing from the people their hard earnings, and hoarding millions in the Treasury for the benefit of monopolies and favored classes.

I have declared as a truth that a tariff is a tax, and I repeat it in order to emphasize it. Now, sir, we must have money to meet the current expenditures of our Government, pay the interest upon the public debt, and comply with the demands of the pension-roll, now grown to enormous proportions, and the settled policy of the Government is to raise the money necessary to meet these purposes by a tariff, or more plainly speaking, a customs tax on foreign manufactured goods, wares, and merchandise brought to this country.

But on behalf of the tax-paying consumers of this country from Maine to California and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from hill and dell, mountain and plain, I enter my earnest protest against a system which raises more money and imposes a greater tax than are required to provide sufficient revenues to meet the necessary wants and demands of the Government.

I enter my solemn protest against a system which has for its object, in imposing a heavier tax than the necessities of the Government demand, the fostering of certain men or classes.

All the citizens of this land are of right freemen; they owe no allegiance to any class and should recognize no task-masters. Under the chart of their liberties, under the law of high heaven, they are free and without shackles on their limbs or mortgages upon the fruits of their brain or muscles; they bow down before no prince, potentate, or sovereign, nor kiss the royal robes of any crowned head; they render homage only to their God and should pay tribute only to their Government. Such at least is the spirit of our institutions, the character of our written national compact.

But how is it in practice? Under this malign system for years the people have been made to submit their necks and receive the yoke of monopolistic oppression; they have been required to bend the knee at the shrine of monopolistic power, and in their extremity they have exclaimed, "Lord! Lord! how much demandest thou of me?" They have been compelled to contribute of their hard earning and sweat-drops for the support of their task-masters, that these task-masters may increase their dividends, roll in luxuries, and revel in wealth.

Freemen though they are by right, yet suffering an Egyptian bondage; living as they do in an atmosphere of boasted liberty, yet service-bound to a manufacturing oligarchy.

Mr. Chairman, in my own State I have met with gentlemen professedly of my own political faith who have said to me: "Be careful; don't agitate the tariff question." With such timidity I have no sympathy. In such Democracy I have no confidence.

For five years and more I have proclaimed the doctrine of a tariff reform in almost every county, city, and town in Virginia. "Don't agitate the question." Ha! The people like serfs must still submit, like vassals still bend their necks, like slaves still work, work in the treadmill of protection! Sir, "Tariff for revenue" is the motto which I have tacked to the mast-head, and if I shall fall I shall fall with my face to the enemy still crying aloud against the oppression of my people. I intend to stand by, uphold and defend as far as God has given me the ability the underlying principle of Democracy upon this question. I may be a weak defender of the right, but I will at least be a bold one.

But I have no fears as to the result. The flag of tariff for revenue will soon float in triumph, and when victory is once inscribed upon it the child has not been born that will ever see defeat written over it.

I repeat, again, a tariff is a tax on foreign manufactured goods, wares, and merchandise.

Almost every article of foreign production, whether used upon the farm in tilling the soil, reaping the crops, or conveying them to market; almost everything that constitutes the common wants of life; almost everything that the humblest citizen wears, from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet, must pay a tariff tax as soon as it is landed upon our shores. This tax, then, being paid by the foreign manufacturer, is added by him to the price, and as he adds it to the price, the home manufacturer at once increases his price the amount of the tax, so that the consumer, whether he buys the foreign-made or home-made article, in the end pays the tax.

Let protectionists seek to their hearts' content to cover up the facts with their sophistries and theories; the plain and simple fact as I have stated it stands out in bold relief for the humblest man in the land to read and understand. He can understand that if he could buy a woolen suit of clothes, for instance, for \$15 without the tax, and must pay \$22.50 for it with the tax, that the tax affects and hurts him. It requires no

literary training, no college breeding, no study of governmental science for him to understand that he is injured in purse when he is saddled with a tax of 50 per cent., or \$7.50, on a \$15 suit of clothes; and the man who seeks to convince him that this is done for his protection will bring his labors to an unhappy end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as the necessities of the Government require taxation well and good, and every patriotic citizen will meet it with cheerfulness; but as soon as the Government imposes a heavier tax than the demands of the Government require, just for the protection of articles manufactured in this country, it is robbing me for the benefit of a class and establishing here in free America a favored class and building up and fostering an aristocracy of monopolies.

The little tax on tea kindled the flames of republican liberty, and a weak people of only 3,000,000 determined not to submit. But though the soul of every American glows with pride as he recalls this historical fact, we have now millions of dollars annually wrung from the people—not to support the Government, but to enable a favored few to carry on trade with heavy profits and sell their wares at prices largely in excess of what the foreign articles could be purchased if it were not for the tax, and largely in excess of the price at which these favored few could sell and make reasonable profits.

So that year by year, week by week, and day by day the fruits of honest toil go into the tills of monopolies rather than into the pocket of the toiler for his own benefit and that of those whom God in his wisdom has given him.

A few days ago in referring to the fact just alluded to, that the tax on tea awakened the slumbering spirit of liberty in the breasts of the colonists, I was met with the reply that it was taxation without representation that inspired the Revolution. I said then as I say now, that the tax was the match that lighted the fire, and that while the rulers of that day only imposed this small tax on the one article, the rulers of this day impose a tax on thousands of articles, and the tax imposed in 1776 was for the support of government while the tax of 1888 is made heavy for the support of monopolies.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to intimate that even the heavy burden of taxation under which the people are now resting would justify a resort to violence. Oh, no. Peace reigns supreme throughout our borders, and the people have their remedy in the ballot, the weapon of the Constitution, and with it a revolution will be prosecuted which will as effectually shake off the shackles of unjust taxation as the Revolution of 1776 shook off the shackles of British tyranny.

Sir, I cannot conceive upon what principle of right it can be maintained that the people of the United States should be taxed more than necessary to meet the demands of the Government. I do not understand upon what principle of justice it can be insisted that about \$100,000,000 in excess of the requirements of the Government should be drawn annually from the people, taken from their pockets, withdrawn from the circulating medium of the country and deposited in the gloomy vaults of the Treasury.

No State would dare tax her citizens more than necessary to run her government and hoard the excess up in her treasury.

Wherein lies any greater right in the National than in the State Government in this respect?

I take it that greater right is claimed by protectionists to sustain them in their position of tariff for protection. It is the only ground, it seems to me, upon which they can in reason stand.

Is it tenable? Has the National Government the right to impose excessive taxation for the protection simply of certain industries and enterprises?

To admit the existence of such a right is to admit that it exists without limit and the extent of its exercise rests alone in the judgment, whim, or caprice of Congress. If the right to raise \$100,000,000 in excess exists, why not \$200,000,000; why not \$500,000,000; why not all the earnings of the consumers above a bare subsistence? Where and when will gentlemen belonging to this school stop? Will they stop when the monopolies cry stop? If so, the millennium will have dawned when that cry comes. Will they stop when the industries of this country no longer regard themselves as "infants"? If so, when the voice of the archangel shall be heard and the last trump shall sound, some "infant," with hoary locks and a body plethoric with dividends and profits gathered from the tills of the poor and wrenched from the hard hand of labor, will stand upon the shores of time and cry for more protection.

"Infant industries!" Mr. Clay, the great apostle of protection, in his debate with Mr. Calhoun, when giant mind met giant mind, and the sparkles flew around like the corruscations from heated metal when struck by a Vulcan's hammer, declared only for a temporary tariff for the protection of our "infant industries."

More than fifty years ago this memorable debate occurred. For more than thirty years the immortal Clay has been in his grave, and the winds of more than thirty winters have sung a requiem to his memory, and more than thirty springs have shed the fragrance of their flowers over the place where inurned is his sacred dust. Childhood then has grown to middle age; middle age then has gone tottering to the grave of old age, yet the industries of which Mr. Clay spoke are

still infants, still crawling and mewling, still in their swaddling clothes, still unable to stand alone, and still sucking the bottle of protection.

Sir, with all due deference, I say what an absurdity. If it were so, if these industries were still unable to stand alone, still required the supporting arm of the Government, still called for protection from foreign competition, as a citizen of the United States, in the face of the world I would be ashamed to acknowledge it. With natural advantages greater than those of any country on the face of the habitable globe; with every improvement known to this inventive age; with a climate of unsurpassed salubrity; with a population strong and sturdy, industrious and energetic, I would blush with shame to admit that we can not compete in our own markets and at our own doors with the fabrics and manufactures of other countries, transported at heavy cost hundreds and thousands of miles across the mighty waters that separate us, without the protection of a heavy tariff.

Standing forth as we do in the majesty of our national power, boasting of our strength, our advancement in the arts and sciences, and in all that goes to constitute a nation's pre-eminent power and strength and greatness, my national pride would be touched to the very quick if I were forced to admit that our furnaces, surrounded by mountains of iron ore sufficient to run an iron belt around the world, and coal in close proximity to smelt every ton of it, our spindles and our looms driven by the finest water-power in the known world, or by steam-power supplied with coal from mines almost at the doors of the factories, or by natural gas, our manufactures sharing all the blessings of a country upon which Heaven has showered its most gracious gifts, can not stand upon their own feet and assert their own independence in their own land against all foreign comers without being sustained and supported by the arm of high protection.

Sir, I am a protectionist, but not a protectionist of monopolies; I am a protectionist of my people. I ask again, if the policy of drawing more money than necessary to support the Government is adhered to, where will it end? Already tens upon tens of millions of dollars have been withdrawn from circulation, and, of course, if persisted in, it is only a matter of time when all the money, the entire circulating medium, will be withdrawn from the channels of business and locked up in the vaults of the Treasury. Then without money for the transaction of business and to meet the wants of the people something must be done; the money must flow back into the channels from which it was taken. How will this be done? Will the people whose earnings are represented by the hoarded millions be permitted to walk up and receive back their own, the dollars representing their hours and days and years of toil and labor, sweat and anxiety? Oh, no; but they must give of the substance left them an equivalent for every dollar; they must buy back from the Government their own. Like the highwayman who demands money from the traveler for the horse from which he has just been dismounted, the Government will demand a *quid pro quo* for the fruits of its robbery. It seems to me, sir, that view this question as you may can find no haven of safety, no solid ground upon which to plant your feet except upon the firm principles of Democracy—a tariff for revenue, which means taxation only for the economical support of Government.

Mr. KERR. You say you are for a tariff for revenue. Do you not know that we have now one hundred and sixteen millions of revenue raised outside of the tariff, and would it not be wise to return to the policies advocated by all the early great statesmen of your State?

Mr. O'FERRALL. In other words, cheap whisky or cheap clothing—that is the issue. I favor cheaper clothing and cheaper necessities of life as against the cheap whisky advocated by the gentleman.

Mr. KERR. I do not advocate cheap whisky. I advocate the prohibition of whisky. You advocate a policy that makes it a permanent source of our national revenue, incorporates it into our system as a permanency.

Mr. O'FERRALL. The gentleman wants the poor man to have cheap whisky, and at the same time to pay a high price for his clothing. Now, sir, no man need drink whisky, but every man must wear clothes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUTLER. How are you on the tobacco tax?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I am for the repeal of the tobacco tax.

Mr. BUTLER. How are you on sugar?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I will determine that when the question is before the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Can you not say now? How are you as to the reduction of the tariff on iron?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I am for a tariff upon iron ore and upon coal.

Mr. BUTLER. How are you upon this bill as to the reduction of the tariff on iron?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I am for this bill as a whole. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I hope I have answered the gentleman.

Cut loose from this principle and you at once embark upon a sea without a pilot, compass, or rudder, to be dashed about and finally wrecked upon the shoals of confusion and anarchy.

Better, far better, confine ourselves to the powers of the Constitution and to the teachings of the fathers than follow in the wake of false prophets and teachers.

But passing on, let me say that the policy of protection is contrary to the principle of independent citizenship. The admitted theory of our Government is that he that sows shall reap the fruit of his own labor, and that it shall not be tolled by his neighbor; that while he must rely upon the means given him by God, whatever he may accumulate shall not be made to pay tithes to another.

Applying this principle, suppose instead of raising revenue by a tariff we were to do so by direct taxation on property, and instead of a custom-house collector we were to have a Federal direct-tax collector. Imagine this dialogue between a Federal tax-collector and a good, honest old farmer:

Collector: Good morning my old friend; how are you this morning?
Old Farmer: Well, just so so. I am not very well, but I have to keep going. My land is not very good and I have to keep scratching to make buckle and tongue meet.

Collector: Well, sir, I am around collecting taxes. Will it suit you to pay to-day?

Old Farmer: Well, money is mighty scarce, but I always try to lay by little by little to meet my taxes and pay my part of the expenses of the Government, and I reckon I might as well pay now as any other time. How much are they?

Collector: Let me see; there is a ticket for \$50.

Old Farmer: All right; here's your money, give me the ticket.

And the old fellow draws a long breath as he sees his \$50, representing many a sweat-drop, the heat and cold of many a day, many a jerk and twist of the plow-handle, and many an ache and pain disappearing in the wallet of the collector; but as a good citizen he willingly paid his part of the expenses of the Government. He is about to return to his work, for time is precious with him—he "must keep scratching,"—when he hears the voice of the collector again:

Collector: Hold on, my old friend, I have another ticket against you.

Old Farmer (turning suddenly and nervously): What! another tax ticket against me? I thought I had just paid my part of the expenses of Government.

Collector: So you have paid your part of the expenses of Government; but this is a "protection" ticket of \$16.66 $\frac{2}{3}$.

Old Farmer: Protection ticket!

Collector: Yes, "protection ticket."

Old Farmer: Well, what sort of a ticket is that? I ain't asking any particular protection. Everybody around here is quiet; my neighbors are all good people, and I don't need any protection; this thing must be a mistake; tell them down yonder in Washington I don't feel afraid; I harm nobody, work hard all day, go to bed with a clear conscience, sleep well, and don't want any fellow around to protect me. Just take the thing back and tell the fellow that sent it out that I can take care of myself, and don't want any protection, and don't want to pay for any.

Collector: Old man, you don't know what you are talking about.

Old Farmer: Yes, I do, too.

Collector: No, but you don't; this is a tax which the Government says you must pay to protect the people who make the clothes you wear, and the wagon you drive, and the plow you use, and the reaper and mower you have, and your sewing-machine, and so on.

Old Farmer: Well, well; has it come to this in our country that things are getting so bad that these people must be protected at their work? Why don't the Government shoot a few of these bad fellows and stop this taxing of poor men to protect workmen against them?

Collector: You evidently don't understand yet. I will explain. You know there are a great many people up in Lowell and Boston, and all over New England, and out at Cincinnati and Chicago, and many other points, who are engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes, cotton cloth, calico, flannel, carpets, sewing-machines, wagons, reapers, mowers, thrashers, plows, brooms, buckets, and other things that you buy, and the Government thinks they do not make money enough out of their business, and says you must pay one-third as much as your tax for the support of Government is to help them. Do you understand now?

Old Farmer (red with anger): Yes, I understand what you say; but what have I to do with helping them? Who helps me? I have a hard time of it. I sell my corn for 40 cents when I ought to have 70 cents; I sell my wheat for 78 cents, when I ought to get \$1; I sell my hay for \$4.50, when I ought to have \$8, and I get small prices for everything, and I can't see what I have to do with helping them. They don't help me. If they don't make money enough at their business, why don't they quit and try something else? That's the way people do around here. Oh, pshaw, you must be fooling me.

Collector: No, I am not fooling you; I am in dead earnest. It is my business to collect, and you must pay or I will have to levy on your horse.

Old Farmer: Well, this is a strange thing to me; but I am a law-abiding man and I suppose I must pay. So here is your money. Give me the ticket. But before you leave I want to ask you a question.

Collector: All right; what is it?

Old Farmer: Is this Democratic doings or Republican doings?

Collector: Oh, it is the doings of the G. O. P.—the grand old party—the Republican party.

Old Farmer: Just as I expected. Well, sir, I am a Democrat and have been voting that ticket for many a year, but if Mr. Cleveland and the Democratic party don't bring about the old-time way of doing things and let every tub stand on its own bottom, I don't expect to vote any more. Good day, sir. [Loud applause and laughter.]

Now, sir, this is simply a homely illustration of just what the Government is doing under the present high tariff system. After drawing money enough to pay the expenses of Government, it imposes a tax of one-third more for the protection of or to help and aid the manufacturing monopolies of the country increase their profits and swell their dividends.

Attempt to disguise it as you may, or to cover it up under all the fallacies of the protective idea, still it stands out in its hideous form of oppression and imposition.

Let me take another illustration. Suppose the laboring man, who delves day in and day out, from week to week and year to year, goes to a store to purchase clothing for himself and family. He buys a pair of boots at \$6, and a suit of cloths at \$18, shoes for his family costing \$10, cotton cloth costing \$3, calico and other necessary articles amounting to \$13; aggregating \$50. More than \$20 of this bill is tariff tax and more than \$5 of the \$20 is protection tax—tax to protect the manufacturers. "Protection!" Protecting a man by taking money out of his pocket. What an anomalous proposition!

Men struggle and bend their energies in the pursuit of money; they strain their nerves, tax their muscle, and charge their brain to accumulate for old age or for days of sickness, that they may be protected from want; this is the rule of mankind; but the Government, reversing human rule, says to the poor man, we must take your earnings for your protection. I repeat, what an anomaly!

I will now, Mr. Chairman, refer to some of the arguments used by protection leaders to sustain their theory that protection increases wages, stimulates enterprise, enhances the value of property, furnishes home consumption of our products, and promotes the general prosperity of the country.

Let us refer to the statistics of the country—for there we find authentic facts to which we can not close our eyes.

Does protection increase wages?

Between 1850 and 1860, an era of low tariff, when the Government imposed a tax only for its economical support, wages increased 18 per cent.

During the next ten years, from 1860 to 1870, when a war was raging for four years of this time, and prices were inflated and protection was at high-water mark, wages increased only 7 per cent.

Does protection give a home market to the products of our soil?

In 1850, under low tariff, we raised 867,453,967 bushels of cereals; 851,502,312 bushels were consumed at home; 15,951,655 bushels were exported. All but 1.9 per cent., or less than two bushels in the hundred, of our entire cereal productions found a market at our doors. In 1860, when the tariff was still lower than in 1850, we raised 1,239,039,945 bushels; 1,216,084,810 bushels were sold in this country; 22,955,135 bushels were sent abroad. Only 1.8 per cent., even a smaller per cent. than in 1850, was forced to seek a foreign market.

Now look at the picture presented by the year of the highest tariff. In 1870 our productions amounted to 1,629,027,600 bushels; 1,571,737,179 bushels found home consumption; 57,290,521 bushels were exported. Three and a half per cent. was compelled to seek sale in other countries. Between 1850 and 1860 productions increased 45.1 per cent., while between 1860 and 1870 they only increased 31.4 per cent. Between 1850 and 1860 exports advanced only 43.9 per cent., while between 1860 and 1870 they advanced 149 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In 1860 we exported only a very small per cent. of our corn; in 1880 we exported a large per cent. In 1860 we exported only a small per cent. of our wheat; in 1880 we exported a large per cent.

And just here I will say that the wheat which was exported in 1860 brought remunerative prices, for it had scarcely any competitor in the market; in 1880 it was placed in competition with the wheat of India, raised by cheap labor and sold at sacrificing prices, and this was the result of the protective system which drove England from our shores with her manufactured articles, and forced her to develop the wheat-growing facilities of India, and brought our wheat in competition in the English markets with the wheat grown by the outcasts of India and the cheap labor of Russia.

Does protection increase the wealth of the country and add to its general prosperity?

Investigations will show that between 1850 and 1860 wealth was more than doubled, increasing 126 per cent., or more than 12 per cent. per annum, while between 1860 and 1880 the increase was only 6 per cent. per annum.

Mr. Chairman, I regard these statistical facts as full, complete, and indisputable answers to every argument which has been or can be adduced in favor of the policy of a high protective tariff. They are not the result of imagination or fancy, of prejudice or bias, but their truthfulness is vouched for by this great Government.

Protectionists say that protection increases the prices of the products of the farm. Let us see how statistics bear them out.

WHEAT.

For the ten years between 1850 and 1860 the price of wheat ranged from \$1.32 to \$1.84 per bushel.

For the ten years between 1870 and 1880 the price of wheat ranged from \$1.13 to \$1.66 per bushel.

A difference of about 20 cents per bushel in favor of the low tariff years.

CORN.

Between 1850 and 1860 the price of corn ranged from 66 to 93 cents per bushel.

Between 1870 and 1880 the price of corn ranged from 49 cents to 79 cents.

A difference of from 14 cents to 17 cents per bushel in favor of the low tariff years.

OATS.

Between 1850 and 1860 the price of oats ranged from 46 to 65 cents per bushel.

Between 1870 and 1880 the price of oats ranged from 34 to 53 cents. A difference of 12 cents per bushel in favor of the low tariff years.

FLOUR.

Between 1850 and 1860 the price of flour ranged from \$4.96 to \$7.18 per barrel.

Between 1870 and 1880 the price of flour ranged from \$4.25 to \$6.60 per barrel.

A difference of 58 to 71 cents per barrel in favor of the low tariff years.

MESS PORK.

Between 1850 and 1860 the price of mess pork ranged from \$14.31 to \$19.75 per barrel.

Between 1870 and 1880 the price of mess pork ranged from \$12.35 to \$18.94 per barrel.

A difference of from 91 cents to \$1.90 per barrel in favor of the low tariff years.

WOOL.

Between 1850 and 1860 the average price of wool was about 28 cents per pound.

Between 1870 and 1880 the average price of wool was about 31 cents. A difference of 3 cents per pound in favor of the high tariff years.

So the wool-grower received \$3 more on his 100-pound clip in 1880 than in 1860, and then paid many times that in tariff on woolen goods which he bought.

Now let us take the small farmer and see how he stood between 1870 and 1880 as compared with how he stood between 1850 and 1860.

Suppose he raised each year—

100 bushels wheat, he got for it between 1850 and 1860 20 cents per bushel more than between 1870 and 1880, or.....	\$20.00 more.
300 bushels corn, he got for it between 1850 and 1860 an average of 15 cents per bushel more than between 1870 and 1880, or.....	45.00 more.
200 bushels oats, he got for it between 1850 and 1860 12 cents per bushel more than between 1870 and 1880, or.....	24.00 more.
5 barrels mess pork, he got between 1850 and 1860 \$1.44 per barrel more than between 1870 and 1880, or.....	7.20 more.

RECAPITULATION.

Wheat.....	\$20.00
Corn.....	45.00
Oats.....	24.00
Mess pork.....	7.20
	<hr/> 96.20 more.

To say nothing about his other products.

Deduct, then, from this, his higher price of \$3 on 100 pounds of wool which he received between 1870 and 1880 than between 1850 and 1860, and the small farmer will see and read for himself that between 1850 and 1860 he was \$93.20 better off annually upon the products to which I have referred than between 1870 and 1880; that these fruits of his labor brought \$93.20 more annually under low-tariff Democratic rule than under high-tariff Republican rule.

If the products of a farmer were two, three, or five times as great as these I have given, of course, his loss under high-tariff Republican rule was two, three, or five times as great as in the illustration.

Protectionists say that protection improves the farms and makes them more productive and profitable. Let us see what statistics show in regard to this matter.

Average yield per acre of cereals.

Wheat:		Barley—Continued.	
1860.....bushels.....	16.0	1855.....bushels.....	21.4
1885.....do.....	10.4	Buckwheat:	
Corn:		1860.....do.....	23.2
1860.....do.....	37.3	1885.....do.....	13.8
1885.....do.....	26.5	Potatoes:	
Rye:		1860.....do.....	119.0
1860.....do.....	18.1	1885.....do.....	77.2
1885.....do.....	10.2	Hay:	
Oats:		1860.....tons.....	1.42
1860.....do.....	29.6	1885.....do.....	1.12
1885.....do.....	27.6	Tobacco:	
Barley:		1860.....pounds.....	1,019.0
1860.....do.....	29.0	1885.....do.....	747.8

Let us see how the farmer stood in 1885 as compared with 1860. Suppose in 1860 and in 1885 he had the same quantity of ground in cul-

tivation and use, say 20 acres in wheat, 30 acres in corn, 5 acres in rye, 10 acres in oats. How would the account stand?

Products.	Area.	1860.	1885.	Difference.
	Acres.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Wheat.....	20	320	204	116
Corn.....	30	1,113	795	318
Rye.....	5	90½	51	39½
Oats.....	10	296	276	20

He puts the same labor and capital in and gets in return 116 fewer bushels of wheat, 318 fewer bushels of corn, 39½ fewer bushels of rye, 20 fewer bushels of oats.

If that is protection, well indeed can the farmers of this land exclaim, "God save us from such protection!"

These 65 acres would have brought him in 1860, as follows:

320 bushels wheat, at \$1.35, lowest.....	\$432.00
1,113 bushels corn, at 64 cents, lowest.....	712.42
90½ bushels rye, at 80 cents, lowest.....	74.40
296 bushels oats, at 37 cents, lowest.....	109.52
Total.....	<hr/> 1,328.34

Now, in 1885 what would they have brought him?

204 bushels wheat, at 88 cents.....	\$179.52
795 bushels corn, at 40 cents.....	318.00
51 bushels rye, at 60 cents.....	30.60
276 bushels oats, at 27½ cents.....	75.80
Total.....	<hr/> 603.92

His gross receipts from the same acreage and crops dropped down from \$1,328.34 in 1860 to \$603.92 in 1885, or a loss of \$724.42.

That is the kind of protection our Republican friends offer to the man who follows the plow.

Mr. KERR. Certainly the gentleman does not charge the tariff with having reduced the production of the soil so as to diminish the number of bushels raised.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Mr. Chairman, I am answering the argument of protectionists that high tariff brings general prosperity to the country, improves the farms as well as everything else. That is the position I am answering. If the gentleman yields that point, and that tariff has nothing to do with it, the purpose I had in view is accomplished.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman's statistics would go to show that farms are not as productive as formerly. Certainly the tariff is not responsible or that.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Yes, sir, I insist that the tariff is responsible to a very great extent. The farmer is so heavily burdened by tariff legislation that he has not money to keep up the fertility of the soil, and must cultivate it as best he can. That is one reason why the fertility of the soil has gone back.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. You are right.

Mr. O'FERRALL. That is the kind of "protection" our Republican friends offer to the man who follows the plow.

Mr. DINGLEY. Allow me a single remark at this point in order that there may be no misunderstanding of the facts. Statistics of this kind are apt to be deceptive. The gentleman has given the price of wheat in the city of New York for a decade before the war and for a decade since the war. Now, is it not the fact that in the decade since the war the farmer obtained more per bushel on his Western farm than in the decade before the war, and that the seeming decline in the price of wheat is due to the decline in the cost of transportation from the Western farm to the city of New York?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I might agree with the gentleman but for the fact that the statistics which I am giving are drawn from the census reports furnished by official heads of this Government. Most of the statistics I have cited are good Republican statistics, prepared under Republican administrations.

SMALLER CROPS AND SMALLER PRICES.

In 1860, under Democratic low-tariff rule, the average farm with 65 acres in cultivation would have brought \$1,328.34, while in 1885, under Republican high-tariff rule, it only brought \$603.92.

CHEAPER CLOTHING.

But protectionists, when met with these facts, and when told how agriculture has languished under the protective fallacy, fall back upon the assertion that the farmer buys his clothing at lower prices than he did in former years, and that this results from protection.

Mr. Chairman, he does buy clothing for less per yard or per article than in former years. But I assert that in the course of a year his clothes cost him as much or more than in former years.

The fabrics from 1860 back were substantial; they were good; they were honest as a rule, and they wore well. The fabrics of the present day are, as a rule, "shoddy," made to please the eye, mislead and deceive. Shoes with paper filling, woolen goods three-fourths cotton, pasteboard hats, with fur pasted on the outside, and lined with fantastic colors, calicoes that a new-born babe can tear, domestics that you could almost sift pebbles through, and cloth that a heavy dew will

penetrate to the skin are all sold to the farmer cheap, and he is told to believe what protection has done for him.

O, what authority and show of truth
Can cunning protection cover itself withal.

But it is all show. In a brief season the farmer must return and buy again.

But, Mr. Chairman, protection has not given even these cheap, flimsy articles of wear. It has been the inventive genius of the age that has done it. They have sprung like magic from the brain of the inventor, just as in the days of low tariff, when the invention of the cotton-gin worked a revolution in the price of cotton. Protection seizes hold of everything and claims it as its own. It was protection, its advocates would have us to infer, that conceived the ideas that led to the important inventions of the last quarter of a century. It was protection, according to the idea of our Republican friends, that stimulated the brain of the geniuses of this country who have given to the world in the last two and a half decades the great adjuncts to manufactures, the revolutionizing improvements which have furnished the means of increasing the supply of fabrics for human wear.

Again, Mr. Chairman, protectionists insist that protection gives high wages to the mechanic and laboring man. They point to the fact triumphantly that wages are higher in the United States where we have a high tariff than in England where they have low tariff.

Now, sir, I propose to show the inconsistency of their position. Mark you, they claim that high tariff gives high wages.

Sir, in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland there is a high tariff. All of them are high-tariff countries. England is a low-tariff country. In high-tariff Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland wages are low, while in low-tariff England wages are high as compared with other countries.

I will here give a table of the weekly wages in all these countries.

BLACKSMITHS.

Austria.....	\$3.18	
Belgium.....	5.38	
France.....	5.81	
Germany.....	4.00	England..... \$7.37
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	5.20	

The average wages paid to blacksmiths in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.06, against \$7.37 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$3.31 weekly and \$172.12 annually in favor of the English blacksmith.

BRICKLAYERS.

Austria.....	\$3.55	
Belgium.....	4.56	
France.....	5.74	
Germany.....	4.21	England..... \$7.56
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	5.21	

The average wages paid to bricklayers in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.68, against \$7.56 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.88 weekly and \$149.76 annually in favor of the English bricklayer.

CABINET-MAKERS.

Austria.....	\$4.40	
Belgium.....	5.66	
France.....	6.14	
Germany.....	4.25	England..... \$7.68
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	5.50	

The average wages paid to cabinet-makers in these six high-tariff countries is \$5.14, against \$7.68 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.54 weekly and \$132.08 annually in favor of the English cabinet-maker.

CARPENTERS AND JOINERS.

Austria.....	\$5.10	
Belgium.....	4.07	
France.....	6.20	
Germany.....	4.11	England..... \$7.66
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	4.74	

The average wages paid to carpenters and joiners in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.84, against \$7.66 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.82 weekly and \$146.64 annually in favor of the English carpenter and joiner.

COOPERS.

Austria.....	\$3.64	
Belgium.....	5.17	
France.....	5.58	
Germany.....	3.97	England..... \$7.50
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	4.78	

The average wages paid coopers in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.66, against \$7.50 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.84 weekly and \$147.68 annually in favor of the English cooper.

DRIVERS AND DRAYMEN.

Austria.....	\$2.20	
Belgium.....	3.77	
France.....	5.57	
Germany.....	2.96	England..... \$5.37
Netherlands.....	4.40	

I have been able to find no statement as to Switzerland in this connection. The average wages paid to drivers and draymen in the five high-tariff countries named is \$3.78, against \$5.37 in low-tariff England;

a difference of \$1.59 weekly and \$82.68 annually in favor of the English driver and drayman.

FARM LABORERS.

Austria.....	\$3.50	
Belgium.....	2.72	
France.....	3.10	England..... \$4.02
Germany.....	3.06	
Netherlands.....	3.44	

I have found no statistics as to Switzerland in this connection. The average wages paid to farm laborers in the five high-tariff countries named is \$3.12, against \$4.02 in low-tariff England; a difference of 90 cents weekly and \$46.80 annually in favor of the English farm laborer.

LABORERS.

Austria.....	\$3.20	
Belgium.....	3.00	
France.....	3.77	
Germany.....	3.11	England..... \$4.70
Netherlands.....	3.61	
Switzerland.....	2.88	

The average wages paid to laborers in these six high-tariff countries is \$3.26, against \$4.70 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$1.44 weekly and \$74.88 annually in favor of the English laborer.

PLASTERERS.

Austria.....	\$4.01	
Belgium.....	4.65	
France.....	6.34	
Germany.....	4.43	England..... \$7.80
Netherlands.....	4.00	
Switzerland.....	5.03	

The average wages paid to plasterers in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.75 against \$7.80 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$3.05 weekly and \$158.60 annually in favor of the English plasterer.

PRINTERS.

Austria.....	\$4.85	
Belgium.....	5.94	
France.....	6.64	
Germany.....	5.09	England..... \$7.23
Netherlands.....	4.80	
Switzerland.....	6.78	

The average wages paid to printers in these six high-tariff countries is \$5.68, against \$7.23 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$1.55 weekly and \$80.60 annually in favor of the English printer.

TAILORS.

Austria.....	\$4.03	
Belgium.....	5.58	
France.....	5.02	
Germany.....	3.41	England..... \$7.23
Netherlands.....	5.00	
Switzerland.....	6.96	

The average wages paid to tailors in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.90, against \$7.23 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.33 weekly and \$112.16 annually in favor of the English tailor.

TINSMITHS.

Austria.....	\$3.70	
Belgium.....	4.40	
France.....	5.46	
Germany.....	3.55	England..... \$6.56
Netherlands.....	4.00	
Switzerland.....	4.40	

The average wages paid to tinsmiths in these six high-tariff countries is \$4.25, against \$6.56 in low-tariff England; a difference of \$2.31 weekly and \$121.12 annually in favor of the English tinsmith.

I might pursue this comparison farther, Mr. Chairman, but this will suffice.

Now, sir, if, according to the theory of protectionists, high tariff gives high wages in America, why not in Europe?

If, according to the theory of protectionists, low tariff would bring low wages in America, why not in Europe?

We have heard already, and we will continue to hear during this debate, England abused because of her low-tariff policy, and in the face of the fact that she pays better wages than any country in Europe; but not one word has been said in denunciation of the high-tariff countries where labor is so poorly paid.

If low tariff enables England to pay from 25 to 50 per cent. better wages than are paid by her neighboring high-tariff countries, let us try the experiment of low tariff on this side of the water and see if we can not increase the wages of our mechanics and wage-workers.

We have strikes now all over our country. Who ever heard of a strike in the United States under Democratic rule and low tariff? Now under high tariff we have them every day. Why? I say it is because of high tariff, which has enabled wealth to be accumulated in the hands of a few, who use it to crush down the wage-worker, and then gaunt want, stalking at midnight like a horrible ghost through the precincts of his humble home, haunts his pillow and disturbs his slumbers, and in his desperation he strikes, as he believes, in defense of his rights and for food and clothing for his wife and children.

Mr. Chairman, as sure as there is a God above us there is something wrong in our country and in its policy. High tariff and high taxation in my judgment are the rocks upon which we are being dashed. Let us at least try the experiment of removing them. From 1881 to 1886, both inclusive, there were 3,903 strikes, in which 22,336

establishments were involved, and 13,443 were temporarily closed. The employes actually engaged in these strikes numbered 1,020,832, and those actually engaged with others involved aggregate 1,324,402. The strikes during 1886 numbered 1,412, or nearly one-third of the whole number. I gather this information from a table furnished by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, chief of the Labor Bureau, to Senator COKE.

If protection protects the laboring man and gives high wages, in the name of Heaven, tell me what has produced all this turmoil and trouble in the land?

Following a little farther the line of my remarks in regard to wages. I want to refer to the statement which is so frequently made that wages are better in this country than in England. In fact, if one of our protection friends were inadvertently to leave this statement out of his speech he would no doubt rise in his seat and "ask leave to print it in the RECORD."

I find that statistics show that the total average earnings of mechanics (family of five workers, including children) in Massachusetts are \$803.47; in England, \$517.47; a difference of \$286 in favor of the Massachusetts mechanic. This is a good showing so far for the Massachusetts mechanic.

But there is another side to the picture.

I find, also, that the average total expenses of a family in Massachusetts are \$754.42; in Great Britain \$508.35; so it costs the Massachusetts family \$246.07 more than the English family to live.

Now, let us make up the accounts of both of them and strike balances:

Annual wages of Massachusetts mechanic and family.....	\$803.47
Deduct cost of living.....	754.42
Balance at end of year.....	49.05
Annual wages of English mechanic and family.....	517.47
Deduct cost of living.....	508.35
Balance at end of year.....	9.12
Balance of Massachusetts mechanic.....	49.05
Balance of English mechanic.....	9.12
Net balance in favor of Massachusetts mechanic.....	39.93

Mr. FUNSTON. Will my friend allow me a question?

Mr. O'FERRALL. Most assuredly. I am always glad to yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. FUNSTON. Is it not a fact that the laboring people in England live for less money because they do not live so well as the laborers in similar employment in the United States?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I think that is possible or probable. But if they live for less in England they do fewer hours of work during a day. The American mechanic works harder, works more hours, and expends more strength and energy than the English mechanic.

I am just reminded by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] that mechanics return to England from Rhode Island in order to get better wages; that they can make more and live better in England than in Rhode Island.

Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts. How many returned last year?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I have not looked into the statistics on that point, but my friend from Massachusetts, I have no doubt, can give the gentleman all the figures he may desire.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman pardon me a question?

Mr. O'FERRALL. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. Do not statistics show that in Europe the amount of grain consumed per capita by the laboring population (considering potatoes as grain) is 17.66 bushels annually, and in the United States 40.66 bushels; that in Europe the amount of meat consumed by the laboring population per capita is 57.50 pounds annually, and in the United States 120 pounds annually?

Mr. O'FERRALL. I must insist on the gentleman making his speech in his own time. I appreciate the compliment implied by his interruption.

Mr. WARNER. I trust the gentleman will not call it an "interruption." He gave me permission to ask him the question; and I do not want to be put in the position of having "interrupted" the gentleman.

Mr. O'FERRALL. It was an interruption nevertheless, though with my consent.

Mr. WARNER. I wish the gentleman would answer my question.

Mr. O'FERRALL. So we find that the advantage of \$286 in wages in favor of the Massachusetts mechanic dwindles away to \$39.93 after deducting his living.

In order to secure this little advantage he must work daily more hours and expend more of his strength than the Englishman.

The Englishman saves more in accordance with the time he works than the American.

Yet protection protects! Yet protection gives higher wages and more money!

Now, sir, the Massachusetts mechanic is loaded down with high tariff, the English mechanic is comparatively free. Take the weights of high tariff off the shoulders of the Massachusetts mechanic and let

him stand on an equal footing with the English mechanic, and instead of having \$49.05 at the end of the year, not enough to bury him decently, he will have much more.

He has \$49.05 in spite of high tariff and high taxes; lower the tariff and lower the tax, put him upon the same plane with the Englishman, and then, with feeling, he can say, this is "the land of the free" as well as "the home of the brave."

Sir, I believe commerce between nations should be relieved as far as possible of all fetters and all restraints.

A distinguished son of the South years ago gave utterance to this eloquent truth:

Why should we fetter commerce? If a man is in chains he droops and bows to the earth, because his spirits are broken; but let him twist the fetters from his legs and he will stand erect. Fetter not commerce! Let her be as free as the air. She will range the whole creation and return on the four winds of heaven to bless the land with plenty.

If the settled policy of this country is to raise money for revenue by a tariff, thereby fettering commerce to that extent, let us not fetter it except for governmental purposes, and not for class purposes. If the trade winds shall not carry the white sails of the world into our ports, dropping the riches of every clime into our lap in exchange for our products without let or hindrance, I insist that tribute shall be levied only for the expenses of the national household and not to fill the coffers of monopolies, classes, or individuals.

Referring now to the fact of which we boast that our system of government is more paternal than that of any other government; that it spreads theegis of its protection over every citizen alike, treating all as children of a common parent, let us see if this is not an idle boast, unsupported by facts.

Paternal! oh, how much this word implies! There is no word in the English language that implies more of duty. Paternal duty implies equal maintenance and protection to every child that sprung from the same loins.

Unkind, indeed, would be the father who would, if he had the power, take from the earnings of the son engaged in tilling the soil to make more prosperous the son engaged in manufacturing pursuits; yet that is just what this paternal Government is doing and has been doing through the cycles of many years. It has been robbing the granary for the benefit of the manufactory; it has been hardening the hand of honest toil to soften the hand of idleness; it has been bronzing the cheek of labor to bleach the cheek of ease; it has been taxing poverty to make richer the rich.

That noble calling, agriculture, has been taxed and taxed until you hear on all hands the cry coming up from the farmers, "I was not made a horse yet I bear the burden of an ass."

This high and ennobling occupation is made the pack-horse of this system. It seems to have been forgotten that no craft would spread its wings to the ocean breezes; no spindle would delight the ear with its hum; no water-fall would charm with the music of its machinery; no mine would yield up its treasures; no furnace or rolling-mill would light the heavens with its lurid glare; no steam engine would penetrate our mountains and valleys and arouse their slumbering energies but for the plowshare turning up the soil and the husbandman sowing his seed for the sun and dews of heaven to quicken into life, bring to maturity, and ripen for the sickle.

Yes, it seems to have been forgotten that the husbandman stands pre-eminently the lord of creation; that before no human shrine should he bow; at no human altar should he worship; in no human presence should he cringe; to no human calling should he pay tribute.

Agriculture can live without manufactures; manufactures can not live without agriculture.

But, sir, while these things seem to have been forgotten, and the farmers, always slow to move, have been slumbering upon their rights for years, they are now awakening from their slumber, and I stand here to give warning of the gathering storm in the West, Northwest, and South, which will soon break and sweep over this country with the violence of a Western cyclone, carrying before it the last vestige of a system which taxes the many for the benefit of the few, burdens labor for the benefit of capital, and mortgages the muscles and energies of agriculture and labor for the benefit of manufactures and trusts. I do not want it inferred from anything I have said or shall say that I am unfriendly to the manufacturing interests. On the contrary, I am their friend and will promote their advancement in every legitimate way. I would oppose most vigorously any attempt to burden them for the benefit of agriculture or any other interest. I stand here as an advocate of the fundamental principle of "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none." I stand here as an advocate of the God-given doctrine, "Render, therefore, to all their dues."

It was in this school that I was raised. I was born and reared in a State which from the day-dawn of her existence as a State, in her hours of prosperity and adversity, through all the vicissitudes of her checkered career and the mutations of political parties has ever kept this principle inscribed in golden letters upon her tablet of principles; and to-day she stands as fully armed and as courageous in this battle for its maintenance as when the illustrious sons of her past stood forth in its vindication in debate with their scimeters bright and glistening. Sir, no

greater truth was ever uttered than that contained in one sentence of the annual message of President Cleveland a year ago. He says that—

The vast accumulations of a few among our citizens whose fortunes rival the wealth of the most favored in anti-democratic nations are not the growth of a steady, plain, and industrious Republic.

Who are these immense accumulators? Are they found among the tillers of the soil or the wage-workers? No; they consist of a parasitic class who have lived and grown, thrived and fattened upon the body and thews, sinews, and muscles of the farmers and laboring men of this country. They consist of the manufacturing monopolists, who, under the sanction of law and through a protective tariff system, have enriched themselves and made each a Croesus by making the farmer and laboring man each a Lazarus.

In 1880, in the manufacture of iron the manufacturers laid away 21.57 per cent. upon their investments, and the woolen manufacturers put 35 per cent. upon their investment in their pockets. I speak for the farmers of the Shenandoah valley and Piedmont section of Virginia—sections possessing a soil as rich as any and a population as industrious and frugal as any—when I say that in the most prosperous years and most luxuriant seasons they fall short of 6 per cent., probably do not exceed 4, and in less favored sections agriculture is so depressed that but for stern necessity the soil would be abandoned and allowed to relapse into its virgin state.

With such enormous dividends as these to which I have just referred, it is no wonder that fortunes have been made in brief seasons which "rival the wealth of the most favored anti-democratic nations." Men count their millions now, when ten years ago they could not count their thousands. In the very nature of things I do not believe such fortunes could be made under a normal condition of affairs; it must be abnormal. I know that men may start even in a race, and some will prove to be swifter of foot and will shoot ahead, and even distance others in reaching the goal; but I do not believe any racer can reach the end before the others take the first step, if all had a fair start and equal advantages. Whether this be true or not, I favor as fair a race and as fair a start in life as the Government can make it. I protest against placing upon the farmer boy and laboring boy a saddle weighted down with the weights of protection and taxation, while the son of the manufacturer shall run the race without saddle or weights. Give them a fair start and if the one, no matter which, outruns the other, then let him claim the prize and receive that which he has fairly won.

The agriculturists of this country are looking, anxiously looking, for tariff-reform legislation by this Congress. Let us not disappoint them in their expectations. Let them feel when they look upon their way wheat-fields in their golden hue of harvest time; their long corn-rows laden with their ears; their meadows carpeted in nature's green or dotted with their sweet-scented hay-stacks; their cattle grazing upon their hills and their sheep gamboling in their pastures, that these are their portion under the dispensation of their God, and that their portion, their possessions, their crops, their muscle and brain, sweat and toil shall no longer be taxed for the benefit of A's factory, B's foundry, or D's furnace. [Applause.]

The wage-workers, too, in the cities and in the country, when not compelled to speak with bated breath, demand the repeal of a system which, in the language of a prominent Knight of Labor, "has made more millionaires and more paupers in the last twenty-five years than were ever made in any other civilized country in the world in the same length of time."

The bill presented by the Committee on Ways and Means I indorse as a whole. It gives to the toiling millions cheaper clothes and cheaper necessities of life. It will tend to lighten the burdens under which they have been bending for years. It will tend to raise up the drooping spirit of the tiller of the soil and inspire the wage-worker with new life and energy. It will tend to quicken the step of the farmer and brighten the face of the son of toil. It will tend to shed a halo of happiness over the whole land and convert fields of bramble into fields of grain, and reclaim the soil which has relapsed into its virgin state. It will tend to bring peace and comfort to the pillow of the laboring man and relieve his fevered brain. [Applause.]

It will, sir, give assurance to the whole country that the Democratic party of to-day is true to its pledges, true to its history, and true to its traditions.

In closing I desire to say for myself that in this contest I am for the farmer. Agriculture was man's first and original occupation.

The Lord God when he made man took him and put him in the garden eastward in Eden to work and to keep it.

I am for the mechanic. In the great temple of nature there is no ministry more exalted than that of the enlightened mechanic.

I am for the laboring man. From early morn to the settling of the dews of heaven he toils. Great beads of sweat appear upon his bronzed brow as he wields the ax or slings the sledge, handles the shovel or plies the pick, but with cheerfulness he pursues his task thinking of the cheery greeting he will receive when the sun is set and his day's labor is done.

Yes, I am for the farmer, the mechanic, and laboring man against the unconscionable extortioner, the greedy monopolist, and blood-suck-

ing protectionist, and may God keep me steadfast to the end [Great applause.]

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Chairman, as one of the Representatives of one of the great, progressive agricultural States of the West, I feel it my duty to oppose this bill on the ground that I believe it to be a measure injurious alike to the agricultural and labor interests of the country. In doing this it is my purpose to view the general rather than the specific aspect presented.

This bill has not been prepared upon any principle whatever, but is apparently an emergency or expediency bill, patched up by the Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means without giving a hearing to those whose interests are vitally affected by the changes proposed.

The framers of this bill claim they have followed in the line recommended by the President in his recent message, in which he poses as the friend of the farmer, and we have presented to us a bill which, in my judgment, directly as well as indirectly injures every man engaged in agricultural pursuits in this country. It would directly injure one million of our farmers, because it proposes to put wool on the free-list, and it would indirectly injure every farmer in the country, because it proposes to reduce the duty or place on the free-list so many articles that are now manufactured here, and to destroy so many of the important industries of the country, and thus drive the operatives now engaged in manufactures to agricultural pursuits. In this respect this bill is the most vicious ever presented to the American Congress.

Before recurring to the general thread of my argument I propose to refer briefly to the history of the legislation affecting the wool interests of the United States.

It appears that sheep were brought to this country as early as 1610; that laws to encourage sheep-raising were enacted in Massachusetts in 1645, and as early as 1676 it was written that "New England abounds with sheep." In 1814 the first official estimate of the production of wool was made, and it was estimated at from 13,000,000 to 14,000,000 pounds. Wool was free until 1816, when it became subject to duty at 15 per cent. ad valorem as a non-enumerated article. It was not made dutiable by name until the act of May 22, 1824.

By this act unmanufactured wool, the actual value of which at the place whence imported did not exceed 10 cents per pound, was made dutiable at 15 per cent. ad valorem until June 1, 1825; thereafter at 25 per cent. ad valorem until June 1, 1826, and thereafter at 30 per cent. ad valorem.

In 1828 a still higher rate of duty was placed on unmanufactured wool, namely, 4 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem until June 30, 1829, and thereafter, annually, an additional duty of 5 per cent. ad valorem until such ad valorem duty should reach 50 per cent. On low-priced wool this rate was equal to 100 per cent. ad valorem. Wool on the skin was made dutiable at the same rate as other imported wool. Under these acts the production of wool in the United States had increased to 50,000,000 pounds annually, in 1831.

In 1832 another change was made, and under the provisions of this act unmanufactured wool of the value, at the place of exportation, not exceeding 8 cents per pound, was admitted free of duty. All wool exceeding 8 cents per pound in value was dutiable at 4 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

This provision for the free admission of the lower grades of wool was continued in an act passed in 1833, while all wool above the value of 8 cents per pound was made dutiable at 4 cents per pound and 38 per cent. ad valorem, the latter duty to be gradually reduced to 26 per cent. ad valorem in 1842.

It will be seen that our legislators were not then reckless enough to propose a sudden abandonment of all protection on wool. From the time of the reduction of duty the production of wool seems to have decreased, and the amount of the annual product in 1840 was 42,802,114 pounds, instead of 50,000,000, as it was estimated in 1831.

The act of August 30, 1842, imposed a duty on coarse unmanufactured wool of the value of 7 cents per pound, or under, of 5 per cent. ad valorem, and on all other unmanufactured wool of 3 cents per pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem. It was found that the act of 1832 making coarse wools free had worked great injury to our sheep husbandry, because the provision in regard to low grade of wools was freely taken advantage of by the introduction of large quantities of fine wool duty free.

Then came the so-called Walker tariff of July 30, 1846, which made all unmanufactured wools dutiable at 30 per cent. ad valorem; Thibet and goat's hair at 20 per cent. ad valorem. During this period of tariff tinkering but little progress was made in the production, the total production in 1850, as officially reported, being only 62,516,969 pounds, as against 50,000,000 in 1831, just prior to the act making coarse wools free.

The act of 1857 practically made wool free, for it included in the free-list all wool valued at 20 cents per pound or less at the port of exportation. Sheep husbandry struggled along as best it could under this adverse legislation, and the census of 1860 officially reported 72,571,343 pounds of wool as the product for that year. Here, then, is an increase from 1831 to 1860 of but 22,571,343 pounds, and during this whole period the tariff legislation was uncertain and adverse to home production.

In 1861 favorable legislation began again. A duty was placed on all unmanufactured wool, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, valued at less than 18 cents per pound, of 5 per cent. ad valorem; exceeding 18 cents and not exceeding 24 cents per pound, 3 cents per pound; and exceeding 24 cents, 9 cents per pound. In 1864 these rates were increased. In 1866 the following schedule was enacted:

Class 1. Clothing wools, unwashed, value 32 cents or less per pound, 10 cents per pound and 11 per cent. Value exceeding 32 cents per pound, 12 cents and 10 per cent.

Class 2. Combing wools, value 32 cents or less per pound, 12 cents and 10 per cent.

Class 3. Carpet wools, value 12 cents or less per pound, 3 cents per pound. Value exceeding 12 cents per pound, 6 cents per pound.

Class 1, washed, double duty.

All classes, scoured, treble duty.

Sheepskins, 30 per cent. to July 14, 1870, when they were made dutiable same as other wool.

In 1872, 10 per cent. was taken off above duties. In 1875, 10 per cent. was restored. In 1883, upon the report of the Tariff Commission, it was enacted as follows:

Class 1. Clothing wools, unwashed, value 30 cents or less per pound, 10 cents per pound. Value exceeding 30 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound.

Class 2. Combing wools, unwashed, value 30 cents or less per pound, 10 cents per pound. Value exceeding 30 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound.

Class 3. Carpet wools, unwashed, value 12 cents or less per pound, 2½ cents per pound. Value exceeding 12 cents per pound, 5 cents per pound.

Class 1, washed. Double duty.

All classes, scoured. Treble duty.

Wool on the skin, same as wool.

The above is a complete epitome of wool legislation in the United States. Under the continuance of the protective legislation which began in 1861 the wool industry grew in twenty-five years to large proportions, representing a value of over \$200,000,000 in sheep, and an annual product of over \$70,000,000 in wool and \$40,000,000 in mutton. Under an ample protective tariff the woolen industry acquired a steadiness and solidity of position unknown in former days, when the tariff was being violently changed from one rate to another and when a large proportion of foreign wools came in free of duty. The following table shows the increase in our flocks and in the production of wool under this tariff:

Year.	Sheep.	Total wool.
		<i>Pounds.</i>
1840	19,311,374	42,802,114
1850	21,723,220	62,516,969
1860	22,471,275	72,571,343
1870	28,477,951	120,102,387
1880	42,192,074	240,861,751
1885	50,360,243	308,000,000
1886	48,322,000	285,000,000
1888	44,000,000	261,000,000

The imported wools of the five years beginning with 1880 constituted nearly one-fifth of the quantity manufactured, and but a little more than a tenth of the value of wool manufactured. At the same time the price was not increased to the consumer, as is shown by the following table, which gives the total average prices, in gold, of domestic fine, medium, and coarse washed fleece wool for each year from 1859 to 1888:

	Cents.		Cents.		Cents.		Cents.
1859	49	1867	37	1875	43	1883	39
1860	48	1868	33	1876	37	1884	33
1861	39	1869	37	1877	40	1885	31
1862	45	1870	40	1878	38	1886	33
1863	52	1871	48	1879	36	1887	38
1864	43	1872	62	1880	49		
1865	51	1873	48	1881	42		
1866	43	1874	47	1882	42		

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen from these facts that under an ample protective tariff the wool interest has increased as it never had done under an insufficient tariff, while there is, literally speaking, no precedent for free wool, for never since 1816 has wool entered the ports of the United States free of duty. Why should this great interest of the farmers be suddenly taken out of the protective system and placed upon a free-trade basis? There is no good reason for it. The product has increased by leaps and bounds. The quality, as shown by most competent statisticians employed under a Democratic administration (Messrs. Tichnor and Tingle and Mr. J. R. Dodge), has also improved to such an extent that whereas under a low tariff the weight of the fleece was not more 2½ pounds, now it is about 6 pounds.

Now, I do not wish to be understood as asserting that the tariff has done all this, but I do assert that a protective tariff has stimulated our farmers to improve the breed of their sheep, and hence the quality of the wool, and will continue to do so. And while it is true that under these influences the price of wool has steadily decreased to the consumer, at the same time the increase in production and in the yield in weight per sheep has amply compensated the farmer.

It will be noticed by the foregoing table that the production of wool has steadily decreased since 1884. Two causes have operated to bring this about; the first, the reduction of duty on wool and woolen goods in 1883; secondly, the monkeying attempts at horizontal reduction in the Forty-eighth Congress, and the efforts made in the Forty-ninth

Congress to put wool on the free-list. The business interests of this country demand stability.

Turning now to the consideration of the effect of the protective tariff on the farmer, I will briefly call attention to the agricultural progress of the country under a protective tariff. Before doing this I wish to quote the following paragraph from the report of the Department of Agriculture for 1884, page 471:

The settler in new communities, the pioneer in cultivation of wild areas, who avails himself of his opportunity to select the choicest lands, naturally and rightfully expects to be benefited in the future by increase of values. He may hope that his children will derive further advantage. His reasonable expectations are sometimes fulfilled; often they are disappointed. If the soil proves to be less fertile than more favored regions, or railway facilities are denied, settlement will be slow, roads poor, schools half supported; with such conditions prices of lands will advance with provoking tardiness. If the soil is rich and settlement rapid till all the land is occupied, while there are no industries beyond the line of agriculture, no families dependent on their neighbors for food supplies, no mines or mills, a certain level of moderate values may be reached, but no high prices of land or products will result. This is proved by the census and other reliable facts and by similar facts in the history of every country in which varied industries flourish. The statement that "other industries increase farm values" is, therefore, axiomatic rather than theoretical.

The same facts and similar data in all industrial history show that mere increase of population does not produce the highest values. Industry, not population, creates wealth. Prices are not enhanced by the presence of paupers. Increase of farmers advances prices in new settlements. Beyond a certain limit numbers may diminish prices, as in parts of India and other countries. Dense population, all employed in agriculture, can never raise prices or produce prosperity as the same population judiciously proportioned among productive industries. The increment will ever be "proportionate, not to numbers, but to productive forces in action, degree in skill, persistence in labor."

The above was written by Mr. J. R. Dodge, the statistician of the Agricultural Department, who, for more than a generation, has made a study of this class of statistics.

Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Dodge describes in that paragraph I have seen. I have lived long enough in the West to see the Western portion of our continent change from a region wholly given over to the production of meat and grain to States with diversified industries; towns that had heretofore been distributive points for goods of Eastern manufacture changed into centers of productive industry and distributing the manufactures of their own furnaces, mills, factories, and workshops.

It has been truly said that—

Every blast-furnace, every iron and steel plant, every woolen mill, every cotton factory, and every workshop, where skill and ingenuity are required, have the effect of promoting the entirety of the Northwest—of making the industrial organism more complete. Agricultural life has been supplemented with manufacturing life, each stimulating the other. That the result has been beneficial to the entire population of these States there can be no sort of doubt.

I have seen in the West the beginning of some Territorial governments, and watched the progress of communities there. Some of those Territories are now States of commanding influence. First came the cultivators of the earth, whose business it is to feed the many. Next came those whose occupation it is to clothe such workers and their families, and to shelter them. Then came the manufacturers of implements of all sorts, and, as a consequence of this diversification of industries, came improved homes for the people, schools, churches, and every instrumentality of a higher civilization.

The development of agricultural industries in the vicinity of hundreds of towns in our Western States, where manufacturing thrives, shows how beneficial to the surrounding country, and indeed to the State itself, such industries have proven.

There are hundreds of growing young cities throughout the West whose enterprising people are to-day offering to give to any firm or corporation that will establish a manufacturing plant within their borders both lands and money as a donation, thus to encourage the development of manufacturing industries. The representatives of those people are asked to support a measure in this Congress that will injure, if not break down, the manufacturing industries that we of the West are striving to build up. I now say to those enterprising citizens either stop trying to build up your cities, or vote down the party that will bring forth such a measure as the bill under consideration.

Why do we of the West desire to encourage manufacturing industries? Mr. Dodge, the statistician, has enforced this argument by dividing our States according to the number of their inhabitants engaged in agricultural pursuits. The first group has farmers to the extent of less than 30 per cent., and the land there is worth \$38.65 an acre. In the second group from 30 to 50 per cent. are farmers, and the value of the land is \$30.55 an acre. In the third group the farmers number from 50 to 70 per cent., and the land is worth \$13.53 an acre. In the fourth group the States are chiefly agricultural, and 70 per cent. of the people are employed on the soil, while the land is worth an average of only \$5.18 an acre. In the first group, moreover, the value of the products of the soil is \$457 per capita to the cultivator; in the second group, \$394; in the third group, \$261; and in the fourth group the annual products fall to \$160 per capita. I will not trouble you with the details of this investigation, but refer you to pages 472-474, Report of the Agricultural Department for 1884.

Thus we see that a protective tariff not only benefits the farmer in a direct way, by which I mean the direct protection which he gets; and, by the way, it is not generally known that one-third of the protective custom duties are raised upon agricultural products, but indirectly, as I have shown by the figures of Mr. Dodge, by increasing the value of

his acres and the value of his products, and thus increasing his income; but it also increases the farm laborer's wages. The average wages per month were, in the first class above quoted, \$24.14; in the second, \$23.51; in the third, \$19.51; and in the fourth, \$13.67.

Much has been said by gentlemen on the other side in regard to the agricultural progress of the United States under the tariff, and some gentlemen have tried to show that agricultural progress and development was greater under a low tariff than under a high one. I beg to differ from them.

To explode this sort of argument, based on the flimsiest kind of statistics, I have only to quote the following table, which shows the comparative number of horses, mules, cattle, sheep, and swine at four decennial periods:

Stock.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
Horses.....	4,336,719	6,249,174	7,145,370	10,357,488
Mules.....	559,331	1,151,148	1,125,415	1,812,808
Cattle.....	17,778,907	25,620,019	23,820,608	35,925,511
Sheep.....	21,723,220	22,471,275	28,477,951	35,192,074
Swine.....	30,354,213	33,512,867	25,134,569	47,681,700

It will be seen that the number of our horses increased from 7,145,370 in 1870 to 10,357,488 in 1880, an increase of 44 per cent.; the number of our mules increased from 1,125,415 in 1870 to 1,812,808 in 1880, or 61 per cent.; the number of our cattle increased from 23,820,608 in 1870 to 35,925,511 in 1880, an increase of 51 per cent.; the number of our sheep increased from 28,477,951 in 1870 to 35,192,074 in 1880, an increase of 23 per cent.; our swine have increased from 25,134,569 in 1870 to 47,681,700 in 1880, an increase of 89 per cent. This table includes only the stock of farms, exclusive of ranches. Were animals on ranches included, the cattle and sheep of 1880 would be largely increased, and those of 1870 slightly. At the other dates, the ranch interest was scarcely appreciable.

Nothing could be more erroneous than to declare, as some gentlemen have done, that even the value of our farm animals has decreased, because of course that might take place and yet the number increase; but the value has not decreased.

The values are as follows:

Horses.....	\$946,096,154
Mules.....	174,853,563
Cattle.....	978,002,693
Sheep.....	89,279,926
Swine.....	220,811,082
Total.....	2,409,043,418

The above table is the estimate made by the Agricultural Department in 1888, and is undoubtedly within the mark. According to the census of 1870 the total value of farm animals was \$1,525,276,457, this being the currency value; the gold value would have been \$1,220,221,167, showing a gain from 1870 to 1884 of \$1,188,822,251, an increase of nearly 100 per cent., and this calculation entirely omits the ranch cattle, which, if included, would add several millions to the total, and show an increase of over 100 per cent.

And yet gentlemen have heretofore had the effrontery to tell us on this floor that under a high protective tariff our live-stock has declined 1½ per cent. I do not pretend to be much of a statistician, but I do say that when a gentleman is obliged to estimate the value of the cattle in the United States on the greenback basis in 1870, a year when gold averaged \$1.25, and then to estimate their value on a gold basis in 1880 and deduce therefrom the fact that the live-stock of the United States has decreased under a protective tariff, I say, with due respect to my friends, that when the cause of free trade has to be bolstered up by such inaccurate statistics as these, it is time to cry stop, and to examine the facts and figures of our agricultural progress in a fair spirit and with an honest purpose in view.

Now let us examine the progress in other branches of agriculture. The number of farms has more than doubled—2,000,000 in 1860 to 4,000,000 in 1880 and 5,000,000 in 1887. Their value has increased in that period from \$6,000,000,000 in 1860 to over \$12,000,000,000 in 1887. The production of cereals has increased under protection from 1,230,000,000 bushels in 1860 to 2,700,000,000 bushels in 1880, an increase of over 100 per cent. The value of live-stock has risen from \$1,000,000,000 in 1860 to \$2,409,043,418 in 1888, while the annual products of the farm in 1880 reached \$3,000,000,000. The number of sheep, owing in part to the duty on wool, has more than doubled—22,000,000 in 1860 to over 44,000,000 at the present time. The home products of wool have increased from 60,000,000 to 275,000,000 pounds. In 1840, with a population of 17,000,000, the United States produced 616,000,000 bushels of cereals and exported but 13,000,000. In 1850 the population had reached 23,000,000; the production of cereals 867,000,000 bushels. The exports, however, had increased but little, being 16,000,000 bushels. In 1860 the population was 31,000,000, the production of cereals 1,240,000,000 bushels, and the exports only 23,000,000 bushels. In 1870 the population had reached 38,500,000, the production of cereals 1,630,000,000 bushels, and the exports something over 57,000,000 bushels. From this date the population of the country has increased some-

thing like 3 per cent. per annum, while the annual average production of cereals has averaged since that time nearly 2,000,000,000 bushels, and the annual average exports have been about 150,000,000 bushels, the average annual exportation of wheat alone being 111,000,000 bushels during the period from 1873 to 1883.

How is it possible, then, that manufacturers have in any way interfered with agricultural progress? My attention has been called recently to the second report of the royal commission to inquire into the depression of trade and industry in Great Britain, and I find there, on page 295, in the testimony of Sir James Caird, given on the 4th of March, 1886, some facts bearing on the decline of agriculture in that country. Forty years ago, when Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright were in their prime, they were advocating a policy of free trade for England, precisely as many of our eminent friends on the other side are now advocating a similar policy for the United States. England at that time was strong in manufactures, and the protective tariff was more particularly intended to help the agriculturists. In this country, at the present time, circumstances are reversed; we are strong in agriculture, though we are not strong enough in manufactures to compete with the world.

It was therefore necessary for Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright to use their persuasive eloquence (and Mr. Cobden was particularly eloquent and particularly persuasive about that period, for he had received direct from the English manufacturers the modest sum of \$1,000,000 for his services in bringing about free trade—see *Morley's Life of Cobden*) to convince the farmer that he would be benefited by this step as well as the manufacturer. In one of his speeches that gentleman said:

I believe when the future historian comes to write the history of agriculture he will have to state: "In such a year there was a stringent corn law passed for the protection of agriculture. From that time agriculture slumbered in England, and it was not until, by the aid of the Anti-Corn Law League, the corn law was utterly abolished that agriculture sprang up to the full vigor of existence in England, to become what it is now, like her manufactures, unrivaled in the world."

Now the advocates of free trade on this floor are not only telling the wool-growers of the country that they will be benefited by free trade, but they are also telling the manufacturers the same thing. Is it not fair to ask if the prophecies of Mr. Cobden have been fulfilled in England? On the contrary, the agricultural population has actually decreased. One-third less persons are now employed in agriculture than formerly. Land is going out of cultivation. Already 1,000,000 acres have gone out of wheat cultivation in England, and 1,300,000 acres have gone out of grain and arable cultivation in Ireland.

But what does Sir James Caird say? He says that within ten years the landlords in England have lost 30 per cent., the tenants 60 per cent., and the laborers 10 per cent. of their income; and putting that into figures it brings into bold relief the fact that on \$325,000,000 of rental for the United Kingdom the landlords' loss of 30 per cent. would be equal to about \$100,000,000; and the tenants' 60 per cent., inasmuch as their income may be taken at half the rental, would be just the same, that is to say, 60 per cent. on half rental, is also \$100,000,000, while it would be difficult to estimate the amount of reduction in the income of the laborers. It is estimated that the total loss in spendable income, owing to the decline of agriculture in England, per annum is \$214,000,000, taken from the annual income of the landlords, the tenants, and the farm laborers.

Does any one doubt that if we pursue a similar policy to our manufactures and to some extent to our agricultural interests, as England has done, that the results will be the same? I think that they will be.

We have seen during the past twenty-five years a progress in this country, agricultural, mechanical, industrial, and commercial, which has been unequaled by that of any other country in the world. Our railroads have increased, our manufactures have multiplied, our farms have been improved, and the products of our fields and mines have increased at a more rapid rate than ever before. Gentlemen may come here and juggle with percentages and try to make it appear that this is not true. I affirm that reference to official statistical data, easily obtainable by those who seek the truth, shows this to be true beyond the possibility of contradiction.

How has the laboring man fared? He has been benefited in two ways, by the increase in wages and by a decrease in prices of all necessities. Let me call attention to the following table, which shows the difference between wages paid laboring men here and those paid in free-trade England:

Occupation.	England.	United States.
Book-binders.....	\$6.00	\$15.00 to 18.00
Brush-makers.....	6.00	15.00 to 20.00
Boiler-makers.....	7.75	16.50
Brick-makers.....	3.54	11.86
Bricklayers.....	8.00	21.00
Blacksmiths.....	6.00	13.30
Butchers.....	6.00	12.00
Bakers.....	6.25	12.75
Blast-furnace keepers.....	10.00	18.00
Blast-furnace fillers.....	7.50	14.00
Bolt-makers.....	6.50	16.50
Bolt-cutters.....	3.00	10.00
Coal-miners.....	5.88	10.00
Cotton-mill hands.....	4.60	6.72

Occupation.	England.	United States.
Carpenters.....	7.50	15.00
Coopers.....	6.00	13.25
Carriage-makers.....	6.75	13.00 to 25.00
Cutlery.....	6.00	12.00 to 20.00
Chemicals.....	4.00 to 6.00	13.00 to 16.00
Clock-makers.....	7.00	18.00
Cabinet-makers.....	7.00	18.00
Farm hands.....	3.00	7.50 to 9.00
Glass-blowers.....	6.00 to 9.00	25.00 to 30.00
Glass (partly skilled).....	6.00 to 7.00	12.00 to 15.00
Glass (unskilled).....	2.00 to 4.00	7.00 to 10.00
Glove-makers (girls).....	2.50	6.00 to 9.00
Glove-makers (men).....	4.50	10.00 to 30.00
Hatters.....	6.00	12.00 to 24.00
Iron-ore miners.....	5.50	12.00
Iron molders.....	7.50	15.00
Iron, per ton (finished).....	2.00 to 3.00	5.31 to 8.71
Heaters and rollers.....	10.00 to 12.00	20.00 to 30.00
Instrument-makers.....	7.00	18.00 to 20.00
Laborers.....	4.10	8.00
Longshoremen.....	8.00	15.00
Linen thread (men).....	5.00	7.50
Linen thread (women).....	2.35	5.22
Machinists.....	8.50	18.00
Masons.....	8.00	21.00
Printers (1,000 ems).....	.20	.40
Printers, week hands.....	6.65	13.40
Pattern-makers.....	7.50	18.00
Painters.....	7.50	15.00
Plumbers.....	8.00	18.00
Plasterers.....	7.50	21.00
Potters.....	8.67	18.30
Polishers.....	7.00	18.00
Paper-makers.....	5.20	12.00 to 24.00
Puddlers, per week.....	8.00 to 10.00	18.00 to 20.00
Quarrymen.....	6.00	12.00 to 15.00
Ropemakers.....	5.25	9.00 to 12.00
Railway engineers.....	10.00	21.00
Railway firemen.....	5.00	12.00
Shipbuilding—		
Boiler-makers.....	7.00	14.00
Machinists.....	7.00	14.15
Coppersmiths.....	6.50	16.50
Platers.....	8.00	18.00
Drillers.....	6.00	12.00
Riveters.....	8.00	17.40
Riggers.....	5.50	11.00
Pattern-makers.....	8.00	24.00
Salt-makers.....	6.00	9.00 to 10.50
Silk (men).....	5.00	10.00
Silk (women).....	2.50	6.00
Scarf-makers.....	1.50 to 2.25	6.00 to 9.00
Servants (month).....	5.00	15.00
Stationary engineers.....	7.50	15.00 to 18.00
Soap-makers.....	5.00	10.50
Tinners.....	5.00	8.00 to 10.00
Teamsters.....	5.25	12.00 to 15.00
Upholsterers.....	8.00	18.00
Watchmakers.....	8.00	18.00
Wire-drawers.....	11.00	22.00

Mr. Chairman, if the framers of this bill are so anxious to benefit those who wear woollens, use blankets and carpets, why were not the manufactured articles admitted free of duty? Why put the raw material, as wool is called, on the "free-list" and retain the duty on woollens? Does the distinguished chairman suppose the manufacturers will not take advantage of this omission and, while getting their raw material free, will they not demand the same price for the manufactured article as before? Does he suppose he can thus deceive the consumer?

He may hope to do so until after the next election, but if I am not mistaken the American people have already measured the depth and breadth of the injuries the passage of this bill would bring to them, and will not be deceived by the theorists who father it.

	Duty, ad valorem.
Wool free—flannels.....	40 per cent.
Wool free—blankets.....	40 per cent.
Wool free—clothing.....	40 per cent.
Wool free—cloaks and dress goods.....	40 per cent.
Wool free—carpets.....	30 per cent.

All in the interest of the manufacturer and importer, nothing for the consumer.

Is there any question as to the duty of the representatives of a progressive people? I think not; and in my judgment it is very fortunate for the country that Congress has never yet followed any recommendations made by the President in reference to financial matters. The country has not forgotten the letter written his party friends before his inauguration, and now he comes urging the reduction of the surplus and suggesting the mode of procedure, the bill under consideration being framed, as we are told, to meet the suggestions made in the message.

Let us dissect this message, as well as some others from the President:

Two years ago, in his annual message to Congress, he urged the suspension of silver coinage, declaring the many millions of silver then in the Treasury to be an "idle mass," and referred pathetically to "the ceaseless stream of silver" which threatened "to overflow the land." Fortunately, as the event has shown, Congress did not heed his advice, and there has since been added to our stock of silver an amount substantially equal to what, at the time his message was sent to this Congress, the President and his financial advisers treated as our Treasury surplus which they said should be given to the people to meet their

monetary needs and avert the threatened financial disaster which might result from adding a few millions to it. If the President is, so far, right in this message, it seems evident that he was misled when he wrote the former one. The keynote of the President's recent message is that the country needs for monetary use all the Treasury surplus. This is doubtless true, but he devotes nearly the entire message to urging the reduction and abolition of tariff duties as practically the only proper means of preventing undue Treasury accumulations, and makes a special attack upon the tariff on manufactured articles and upon wool and other products which he calls raw material, and which, as I have shown, have been immensely increased in this country by means of a protective tariff.

He neglected the opportunity to mention the necessity for liberal expenditures for our much-neglected coast defense and for other important improvements which had been emphasized by Secretary Endicott, and devotes only a single paragraph of the merest reference to reports of the heads of Departments, seemingly quite forgetting that a considerable amount of Treasury surplus may be absorbed in the economical doing of the large amount of legitimate Government work, long neglected and now urgently required in the interest of over 60,000,000 of people. He fails to say that large appropriations for needed improvements may be in the line of the truest economy, but does not neglect to give a general warning against extravagant appropriations. This, however, is not inconsistent with his neglect to render operative by his signature many important bills passed by the last Congress. He aids Congress with no specific information or recommendations as to what reductions in tariff, falling short of the entire abolition of duties, on different lines and grades of manufactured articles will actually effect a reduction of revenue, although he must be aware that in some cases reduction of tariff might result in such increased importations as would greatly increase revenue.

That a large increase of importations in some lines of manufactured articles would result from any considerable reduction of tariff thereon seems as certain as that a reduction in the wages of workers would also ensue, and that many would be deprived of their accustomed employment. The President makes the omission to recognize this prospect more conspicuous by intimating that any reduction in the price of home manufactures may be made to affect only employers (who are, as he intimates, now making undue profit), which will seem as improbable to intelligent employes as to manufacturers.

Our home market is the best in the world. If we lose it in part, where, with the necessarily sharp competition with the products of lower priced labor abroad, shall we find compensation for that loss? It may be that the United States can now successfully compete with great manufacturing countries in making and selling palace cars and locomotives, but in many lines of staple goods such competition would only be made possible through such a reduction of wages as would make the wages paid here approximate to those abroad.

We are told that—

Millions of our people who never use and never saw any of the foreign products purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles.

This is a serious error if intended to apply generally to manufactured necessities in common use, as a little attention to facts will show.

We are further told that—

The worker in manufactures receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and perhaps before he reaches his home is obliged, in his purchase for his family use of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase in price which the tariff permits the hard-earned compensation of many days of toil.

If this were a common occurrence, as is intimated, it would be a serious matter. But what are the facts? What manufactures are chiefly consumed by "workers in manufactures?" Their food is for the most part necessarily of home production. The cost of meat and bread can be very little affected by the tariff. The tariff upon sugar is more considerable than that upon any other article of food and affects the cost of the living of wage-workers more than that upon all other food products combined.

But the tariff upon sugar is not noticed by the President, it being the production of a Southern State. Sugar is one of the few articles, consumed largely and produced sparingly in this country, upon which a heavy duty is imposed. The tariff upon it yields a revenue about equal to our estimated last year's surplus, \$58,000,000, and more than 25 per cent. of all revenue from customs. But there seems to be no good reason for the President's omission to even mention the tariff upon sugar, which is an article of as common use as wool, especially as the percentage of duty as well as the total revenue derived from sugar is much greater than in the case of wool and woolen goods. My own opinion is that the duty should be removed from sugar and that a sufficient bonus should be given to our sugar producers to protect the industry and encourage production until the United States shall produce the sugar we consume.

The cost of furniture used by the "worker in manufactures" or by the farmers can generally be made only in a slight degree more expensive by reason of the tariff. His carpets may cost him a little more here than the same quality would, at the moment, if of English man-

ufacture, imported free of duty. But the total wholesale value of all carpets, domestic and foreign, sold in this country, yearly, indicates a consumption, at present prices, of little more than 50 cents' worth for each person. Of course any enhancement of the price of common grades of home production, by means of the tariff, can be but a mere trifle for each family. But the worker has the satisfaction of knowing that the price of carpets has been greatly reduced within a few years, and is now much lower than it otherwise would be, by reason of our extensive manufacture thereof, made possible by the tariff. Doubtless the worker in manufactures also understands that if we should import one-half as many millions of yards of carpets as we now manufacture, the price of the foreign product would be enhanced by our greatly increased demand for it.

Evidently, the largest expenditure made by the average worker in manufactures for manufactured articles other than food is for clothing. It has often been shown by the testimony of experts that the grade of clothing usually worn by such workers costs but little, if any, more here than in foreign countries, although the higher grades of clothing doubtless do cost more here. The average wage-worker having received his wages "at the desk of his employer," does not on his way home buy a seal-skin coat. Such an article might, perhaps, cost the equivalent of the wages of several "days of toil" more here than in London. But such an article is a luxury, and the President says that he finds no fault with the tariff on luxuries.

May not a suit of clothes which costs from \$80 to \$100 be properly called a luxury also?

But the duty on the cloth in such a suit is not more than \$5, which is hardly the equivalent of "many days of toil." It is needless to say that such a suit is seldom required by the "worker in manufactures" or farmers. There is a tariff amounting to about 40 per cent. on cotton goods. Some domestic cotton goods might, perhaps, at the moment be bought a little less were there no tariff.

The cost of other grades is no greater here than in England. If we make the probably all too liberal estimate that one-fourth in value of our entire consumption of cotton goods (including the finest imported goods) is enhanced to the full extent of the tariff upon corresponding foreign goods, the enhancement in accordance with such an estimate amounts to about 30 cents for each person. The cotton cloth used by the masses of our people can be bought here fully as cheaply as in England, thanks to the tariff which has helped to build up the great cotton manufacturing establishments, North and South.

From a somewhat careful survey of the field, considering consumption and prices of the principal necessities of life, as well as the tariff upon imports thereof, it does not appear that the tariff possibly could both directly and indirectly affect the average necessary cost of living to each person in the country more than five or six dollars a year, even upon the President's unwarranted assumption that such things as domestic woolen goods, for instance, are enhanced in price to the full extent of the tariff on like foreign goods. As a basis for this estimate, furniture and household goods, as well as food and clothing and medicine, are considered. Liberal allowance is also made for sundries. In the case of woolen goods the domestic products are assumed to be enhanced in price to the full extent of the tariff on corresponding products, although the facts certainly do not justify the assumption.

The tariff upon such an article as wheat-flour is not considered as affecting the general price of flour in the United States to any appreciable extent, although the tariff upon wheat-flour is 20 per cent. and a few hundred barrels are imported. But wheat-flour is one of our important exports, and we always have a surplus. The theory which the President adopts, however, is that the cost to consumers of our domestic manufactures is enhanced to an extent substantially equivalent to the tariff imposed upon kindred foreign products. His reference to the extensive use of manufactured domestic articles by millions here who never see like foreign products, coupled with his statement that—

Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer—

Seem to clearly refer to such manufactures as flour as well as woolen goods, as both are imported to a greater or less extent, and both are largely produced here. If the theory were well founded, or had any general application, as it apparently has in the mind of the President, it would follow that the tariff upon wheat flour, which in the census of 1880 is classed among our most important manufactures, enhances the wholesale value of a year's product of flour in the United States more than eighty millions of dollars, as the value of our product in 1880 is stated to have been over \$500,000,000. The wholesale market value, of course, includes any possible enhancement effected by the tariff. It seems apparent that, with our present home supply and foreign demand, any possible imports of wheat flour, in the absence of a tariff thereon, would now affect the general price of flour in the United States about as little as a few hundred barrels of water might the general level of the ocean.

Were there no tariff on wheat flour the Canadian miller would get our price for the flour he sends over the border. As it is, he pays tribute to our Government for the privilege of selling his surplus flour

here. The same might be said of other things which we import to a limited extent and produce largely.

The tariff upon wheat, however, may be of great benefit to our Western farmers when the great Manitoba wheat belt shall produce hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat, as it is destined soon to do. The fact is the tariff raises the cost of all the daily necessities of life consumed by workers in manufactures and others far less than many suppose, while there is abundant evidence that the cost has in many cases been greatly reduced owing to the establishment of manufactures here, which would have been impossible without the tariff.

Computations based upon the President's assumption as to increase in price of leading domestic products, of which woolen goods furnish the President a striking example, are so made simply to show how small, even upon such an unwarranted basis, would be the tax imposed as compared with what the President seems to think it is.

The President recommends—

the radical reduction of the duties imposed on raw material used in manufactures or its free importation.

He tries to convince the very small wool-grower, who keeps not more than from twenty-five to fifty sheep, that he, at least, will not suffer from the removal of the tariff on wool. He says in substance that the protection furnished such a farmer augments his yearly receipts not more than from \$18 to \$36; and that—

the increase in price upon a moderate purchase of woolen goods and material to clothe himself and family for the winter—

Is—

as a result of the tariff scheme, more than sufficient to sweep away the whole amount.

The fact is, that the small farmer, who by reason of the tariff realizes \$36 more than he otherwise might from the sale of wool, leaving out of the question the number of his sheep, would pay, his family being of the average size and his expenditure for woolen material for their clothing being also average, certainly not more than about \$8 a year, or a little more than \$2 for each person, on account of the extra cost of all such family purchases imposed by reason of the tariff, even if the price of all domestic woolens were increased to the extent of the average amount of the duty imposed upon foreign woolen goods. It ought to be unnecessary to repeat to intelligent people that the price is not so increased.

The value of our total production of all woolen and worsted goods, including carpets, was in 1880 equal to a little more than \$5 for each of our population. If production has kept pace with increase in population prices have fallen, so that it is doubtful if the wholesale value of the product in the last year was equal to more than \$4.50 per capita. For the year ending June 30, 1887, the value of the imports of woolen goods, including the duty paid thereon, was about \$1.11 for each person, from which it is inferred that the wholesale value of our entire consumption of woolen goods can not now exceed about \$5.60 per capita. This average consumption, it should be remembered, is based upon an estimate which includes the most expensive goods as well as those of modern price. Even if the present wholesale price of all domestic woolen goods, including carpets, covered an average increase of 60 per cent. by reason of the tariff, the extra cost so imposed on each person would be little more than \$2.

Probably no necessary of life, aside from food, costs either the average farmer or the "worker in manufactures" as much as woolen goods. Removing the tariff from wool would not obviate this, but lead to the slaughter of millions of domestic sheep, and the exportation of large sums to pay for foreign wool. After a temporary glut of mutton in our markets the price of mutton would doubtless be increased enough to offset any gain to consumers of woolen goods who are also consumers of mutton, which might follow the removal of the tariff upon wool.

Doubtless all will agree with the President that such articles as do not in any way compete with our own products should be placed upon the free-list. Probably we might safely, also, place upon the free-list some things which we produce to a very limited extent, but for any considerable production of which our soil, climate, or other conditions are unfavorable.

A well-known free-trader testified before the tariff commission in 1882 that he believed that a material tariff reduction would result in some reduction in wages; but he thought that the reduction of the cost of living would more than compensate therefor. This seems to be the President's theory also. The admissions of this free-trade witness as to the comparative condition of American and European laborers, which were elicited upon his cross-examination, are, however, worthy of some attention in this connection.

He admitted his conclusion, resulting from his personal observation in several countries, that the American laborer is able to have meat and carpets (which, however, the witness did not consider necessary), to dress his family more expensively, and to enjoy many luxuries practically unknown to the European laborer, and he also believed that the American laborers are able to make much larger savings-banks deposits than the English laborers can.

Representative Democrats who favor radical tariff reduction as relates to articles on the production of which some of our greatest industries

depend—Democrats like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and the honorable Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT], admit that the President's claim that the tariff upon corresponding foreign goods affects our home products to the extent of the tariff rate should be discounted just one-half. It is but just to say that after examining the subject in the light of the best statistics relating to prices in this country, as compared with those in foreign countries, I am satisfied that the claim of these gentlemen should also be discounted at least one-half.

Let us use the surplus. Let us pay our debts. Let us call the Government bonds, and thus and in other legitimate ways furnish our people with not merely what the President treats as surplus, but with a much larger amount of our vast accumulation, which no sound policy requires us to keep locked up in the Treasury vaults.

But when this money shall have been made to pulsate like blood in the veins of our great internal commerce and to vivify our industries, let us not send it all out of the country to pay for foreign goods to take the place of what should be manufactured here, in order to gratify a few theorists at the expense of the well-being of the multitudes of our countrymen.

It is a favorite theory of some free-traders, who most loudly applaud the President's message, that but for the tariff we might import vastly more manufactured articles than at present, and that, such are our agricultural advantages, thousands of workers in manufactures might with profit "go to the soil" to develop its resources and produce the wherewith to pay for greatly increased importations. A witness who represented a free-trade league testified before the Tariff Commission to his belief that under the beneficent operation of free trade we might so increase our imports that by 1890 they might amount to about \$1,500,000,000, or much more than double our present importations, the increase being equal to more than 12½ per cent. of the value of all our manufactures, estimating their value at about \$6,500,000,000 a year.

Bearing in mind the President's opinion, that all the Treasury surplus is needed for monetary use among our people to prevent financial disaster and serious depression in our great industries, let us consider the probable effect of increasing our importation of manufactured articles to an amount equal to or even as little as 6 per cent. of our manufactures as a result of radically reducing the tariff on manufactured necessities. Of course the importation of certain classes of goods would be increased to a much larger extent.

According to the last census the value of all manufactured products in the United States in 1880 was \$5,369,579,191, to produce which the labor of 2,732,595 persons was required. If such products have increased correspondingly with our increase in population their value would now equal, at a valuation similar to that of 1880, nearly \$6,500,000,000. A corresponding increase in the number of workers in manufactures would indicate nearly 3,308,000 such workers at the present time. Six per cent. of such value would be about \$390,000,000, and 6 per cent. of such workers nearly 198,500. Should we increase the imports of manufactured articles to take the place of our own products to this extent and send 198,500 such workers "to the soil" with their dependent families; if they should consume as much of our agricultural products as now, and if, through some miraculous intervention, they might be able to produce as much as an equal number of trained agriculturists, the increase which we might export, to pay for the increase in imports, would evidently be very inadequate.

In 1880 there were, it appears, 7,670,493 persons engaged in agriculture in the United States. Three billion dollars has been considered a fair estimate of the value of our agricultural products for that year. It is several hundred millions larger than the census estimate for the preceding year. This estimate indicates an average production of about \$391.10 for each person then engaged in agriculture. The greater production of each "worker in manufactures" is chiefly accounted for by the value of material used. If the manufactured articles were imported the material used therein would usually be produced abroad also. Thus other great industries in this country would be injured and more workers lose their accustomed employment.

Conceding the present agricultural product to be as large per capita as in 1880, 198,500 agricultural workers might, under the most favorable circumstances, be expected to produce agricultural products of the value of nearly \$78,000,000, which might be available for export to pay in part for our increase of imports. But those who are now engaged in agricultural pursuits would necessarily lose in case of any considerable contraction of the home market for their products, as well as from the lessening of prices, which would follow a coincident increase in the volume of such products, and especially any attempt to export more than the foreign market demands. We are sometimes told that our agricultural exports might be vastly greater if we imported more manufactured articles, but there is plenty of recent historical evidence to disprove the assertion, unless it might result from greatly reducing the price of such exports.

Although our wheat crop was 74,000,000 bushels larger in 1886 than in 1881, and our corn crop 500,000,000 bushels larger, we exported but little more wheat and less corn in the year ending June 30, 1887, than in the year ending June 30, 1882, in spite of the fact that in the last

twelve months our imports have actually exceeded our exports. How well this simple fact answers the recent statement of the honorable gentleman from Kentucky at Philadelphia, that we "can not send cargoes to foreign ports because we can not bring back cargoes to this protection-cursed country," I leave it to this House to judge. In the period covering the years 1879, 1880, and 1881 the balance of trade was largely in our favor. Our exports of wheat and corn were then vastly greater than now, although we still have plenty of surplus stock which we are ready to sell at a lower price than then. Among the causes which have operated to produce such results may be mentioned short crops abroad then, and large shipments of Indian wheat to Europe of late, as well as contraction in the volume of European metallic money, or, in other words, "appreciation of the purchasing power of gold."

Certainly it can not be said that any greater willingness on our part at that time to take European woolen goods contributed to the willingness of Europe to take our wheat and corn, as our imports of woolen goods are much greater now, owing doubtless, in part at least, to the reduction of the tariff on such goods in 1883.

If there should be no advance in the price of foreign goods, by reason of the increased demand for them, and if we could buy such foreign manufactures abroad as much less as the whole of the alleged enhancement in the value or price of domestic products by reason of the tariff, we might then obtain manufactures hitherto valued at \$390,000,000 here, by exporting, in addition to about \$78,000,000 worth of agricultural products more than at present, nearly \$200,000,000 of gold. Should we pay for our foreign purchases, it would take a little more than three years for us to export all the gold in the country.

If, however, as would probably happen, we should pay for part and incur indebtedness for the balance, our exportation of gold would be slower, but not less certain. Our vast exports of specie in the period in which the low tariff of 1846 was operative (they were in ten years more than \$260,000,000 greater than our imports), followed by the suspension of specie payments and the panic of 1857, should not easily be forgotten. Neither should we lose sight of the fact that in 1887 free-trade Great Britain, according to the Statist, imported merchandise to the amount of more than \$400,000,000 more than she exported.

Under our present system the United States has been and is largely decreasing our indebtedness. Has free-trade Great Britain been as fortunate in this respect? The debt of the United States, per capita, was greater on August 1, 1865, than August 1, 1885, in the ratio of \$84 to \$24—250 per cent. An individual considers it a good thing to decrease his indebtedness. Is it different with a nation?

At this critical juncture, when European nations are clutching desperately at the gold they find slipping away from them, would it not be the height of folly for the United States to involve herself in monetary troubles to help Europe out of hers?

The claim made by some free-traders that we could with such a reduction in tariff, without lowering wages, export enough of our manufactures to pay for our increased importation of manufactures is not considered worthy of serious attention. This is a practical question with which we have to deal, and in the final outcome all the theories of all the free-traders in Christendom will not weigh a feather's weight against the practical common sense of the masses of our workers, even if such theories are adopted by Democratic leaders, who, professing not to be free-traders, eagerly promulgate nearly every free-trade absurdity.

Two propositions formulated by Mr. Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under President Polk, have received much commendation from free-traders. The first, "That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered," will be generally assented to, although there may and will be differences of opinion as to what may properly be considered economical administration. But the second, "That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue," would hardly be in accord with the serious effort which the President advises Congress to make to effect a reduction of revenue. In the case of woolen goods, for instance, raising the tariff 10 per cent. would be much more likely to effect a reduction of revenue than lowering it to the same extent, as lowering it would be sure to increase importations. If the tariff upon such goods is left as it is, it will be found that there is no lack of legitimate ways for disposing of all the revenue derived from it, after proper reductions are effected in other directions. Surely the time has not come for us to cripple our great wool and woolen industries and to strike a blow at others, by making vast exports of the money of the country to pay for what we may well produce.

Events of the past year, not less than the President's message, have called public attention to the necessity of avoiding monetary contraction. In considering the legitimate disposition of the surplus, the Government debt, amounting to many hundreds of millions, need never be forgotten until it is canceled. But it would be better to make even extravagant appropriations for great public improvements, to pay unwarrantably large pensions, to grant large bounties to encourage sugar culture and South American steamship lines, and to make large governmental appropriations for educational purposes in the States, of

however questionable propriety the suggestions may seem, than to send like amounts out of the country to pay for what is now produced here. In one case the money would be distributed among our people, and would furnish a needed condition for general prosperity. In the other it would be lost to the country, and lead to the consequences which usually follow extensive monetary contraction. The President has received much praise in certain quarters for his courage in advocating radical tariff reduction. This Congress may well hesitate before entering upon a course fraught with such apparent peril, even if it fails to receive like approbation from the same source. In endeavoring to steer our financial bark from the Scylla of Treasury accumulation we should be careful to avoid wrecking it in the Charybdis of gold exportation.

Mr. Chairman, we all agree upon two propositions, namely, that the surplus should be reduced and that our revenue laws should be revised.

Then what is our duty? Should we not deal with these questions in a business-like manner? I think so. Then let us do those things which are for the best interests of the country, and at all times be guided by the experience of the past. Let us follow the course so plainly marked out, turning away from the seductive pleadings of the theorist and following the advice of the practical and successful business men of the country. Each member upon this floor has fixed opinions upon the questions under consideration, and probably no two could agree in all details as to what is the true policy. Notwithstanding this fact, it is the duty of every member to submit for consideration the views he may entertain and then try to reconcile the differences that may exist. In my judgment it is the duty of the President to at once expend the surplus now in the Treasury in purchasing and retiring our bonds.

Then Congress should authorize the disbursement of the one hundred millions of gold now held in the Treasury for the redemption of the legal-tender notes. The holding of this vast sum is the height of folly. Why should the Government be required to hold within its own vaults any sum to make good its promise to pay? Using the surplus now in the Treasury and the one hundred millions of gold he would at once put into circulation over \$200,000,000 that are now hoarded, and the obligation of the Government upon which we are paying interest would be decreased that amount less the premium upon the bonds.

To prevent such accumulations in the Treasury in the future, we should have a fair, just, and equitable revision of our revenue laws. This should be done after a careful investigation and a patient hearing of all the interests affected by the changes proposed. The principle of protection to the interests that have been developed in this country should never be forgotten. If we could place lumber, coal, and salt on the free-list, and reduce the duty on sugar and molasses so the revenue arising therefrom should not exceed \$10,000,000 per annum, and use the portion of that sum necessary to encourage sugar-growing in the country, the revenues would be reduced to the extent required and the people of the country benefited and no industry injured.

If we pass the bill under consideration, we strike down and destroy one of our most important agricultural industries, in which over one million of our people are interested; we will force a reduction of the compensation paid to over two millions of wage-workers in the different industries affected by the reductions in duty made in the bill; we give the Canadian farmer a market for his products, and place him upon an equal footing with our farmers of the North and West. Time will not allow me to show all the vicious provisions of this bill. It should and will be defeated. This country is not yet ready to take the first step in the direction of free trade. This Congress will not make glad the hearts of those who for the past thirty years have yearned for the markets of the great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

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

An act (H. R. 7315) to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder;

An act (H. R. 1956) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Gros Ventre, Piegan, Blood, Blackfeet, and River Crow Indians in Montana, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 1805) for a public building at Greenville, S. C.;

An act (H. R. 4365) to authorize the construction of an arsenal for the repair and distribution of ordnance and ordnance stores for the use of the Government of the United States at Columbia, Tenn.; and

An act (H. R. 6894) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889.

H. B. WILSON.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, returning without approval the bill (H. R. 19) for the relief of H. B. Wilson, administrator of the estate of William Tinder, deceased.

The Clerk began the reading of the message.

Mr. BURROWS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, as the reading of this message can not be concluded before half past 5 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that, without finishing the reading, the message be printed in the RECORD and properly referred.

Mr. MILLS. Let this communication be read in the morning. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BACON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9773) granting a pension Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 9774) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Burwell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 9775) for the relief of Harriet Melchor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 9776) for the relief of Nancy E. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to David O. Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9778) granting a pension to Henry W. Howland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9779) for the relief of John H. Merrill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPINOLA: A bill (H. R. 9780) to retire certain officers who served in the volunteer army during the late war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHEES: A bill (H. R. 9781) to grant right of way to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company through the Puyallup Indian reservation, in Washington Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9782) for the relief of Henry C. Davis, Matilda Browning, and Caroline Hall, children and heirs of Lewis H. Davis, deceased—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. YOST: A bill (H. R. 9783) for the relief of the heirs of H. C. Boyd, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9784) granting a pension to Anna Boppell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. D. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 9785) granting a pension to William Burnworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9786) for the relief of J. W. McFerren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9787) to refund to Philip Kershner, late captain Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Militia, \$321.96—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Petition of citizens of Columbus, Miss., against the bill to brand or tax refined lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. C. L. ANDERSON: Petition of T. A. Woods and others, citizens of East Mississippi, relative to holding terms of the United States courts at Meridian, Miss.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Petitions of John Block and of Thomas Bradley, of Walker County, Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELDEN: Petition of Rev. W. P. Hazelton and 25 others, citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of New York, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BLOUNT: Petition of W. D. Curry, administrator of Henry Barnes, of Butts County, Georgia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. C. E. BROWN: Petition of Joseph Altschiel, late postmaster at Hampton, Ark., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAREY: Memorial in reference to the Fort Bridger military reservation, in Wyoming Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill for improving the mouth of the Brazos River, in Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DUBOIS: Petition of the board of commissioners of Idaho County, Idaho, for the passage of bill allowing the Territory of Idaho

to construct wagon-roads between North and South Idaho—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of citizens of Decatur County, Tennessee, in favor of House bill 7389—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of Francis Whittaker & Sons, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of House bill 6138—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles Stoughton and others, of New York, favoring the completion of Harlem Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Resolutions of Pressmen's Union, No. 27, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Chace international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FORD: Petition of Olney, Shields & Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., for reduction of duty on rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLASS: Papers in the claim of Sarah J. Mosby, of Warren County, of Jesse Martin, of Woodruff County, and of Alice Cole, of Calhoun County, Alabama.

By Mr. GOFF: Petition of E. M. Atkinson and others, of West Virginia, in favor of additional protection to wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of dealers in tobacco, of Philadelphia, in favor of the speedy repeal of the entire tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of citizens of New Mexico and Colorado, for an investigation of the Sangre de Cristo land grant, in said Territory and State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of San Juan County, New Mexico, protesting against the location of the county seat of said county at Aztec—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition to be filed with bill for the relief of Isaac Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: Papers in the claim of James J. Ritch, of Scott County, Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., for an appropriation for head-stones for soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OATES: Papers in the claim of Henry Sterne, Bullock County, Alabama—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolutions of the council of Coffeyville, Kans., for the passage of the bill giving the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad the right of way through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICE: Memorial and papers of the mayor and other prominent citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., in relation to the preservation of St. Anthony's Falls—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Minnesota, for an appropriation of \$200,000 for head-stones for soldiers' graves—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of Jackson M. Hoover, of Pierson Peeples, of Pierson Peeples, trustee for Isham Peeples, and of Henry J. Harter, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of John Scott, late postmaster at Brookville, Pa., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Papers to accompany House bill No. 8939 for the relief of John S. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Samuel F. Ryan, of Jackson County, and of George M. Hanaway, of Lauderdale County, Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILKINS: Petition of Rev. Favis Brown and 81 others, citizens of New Concord, Ohio, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of W. A. Pattie, late postmaster at Warren, Va., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. LEE: Of E. S. Pendleton & Son., of Louisa Court House, Va.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Of H. B. Tiffany, of Clyde, Ohio.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Of C. Teal and A. E. Smith, pharmacists, of Ochevedan, Iowa.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. CAREY: Of citizens of Phillips, Lawrence County, Wyoming.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of citizens of Antrim County, Michigan.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Of Robert P. Paulding and 29 others, citizens of Cold Spring, N. Y.

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

By Mr. REED: Of citizens of North Jay, Me.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: Of citizens of Concord, Minn.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BELDEN: Of Peter Kappesser and 21 others, soldiers and sailors, of Syracuse, N. Y.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of soldiers and sailors, of the wives of soldiers and sailors, of the sons of veterans, and citizens, of Osceola County, of Charlevoix County, and of Sherman, Mich.

By Mr. KEAN: Of soldiers of Plainfield, N. J.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Of citizens of Harlem Springs, Ohio.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Of citizens of Ashtabula County, Ohio.

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

By Mr. COOPER: Of the faculty of Ohio Wesleyan University, and others, of Delaware, Ohio.

By Mr. CROUSE: Of 89 citizens of Medina County, Ohio.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of 212 citizens of Mecosta, Lake, and Charlevoix Counties, Michigan.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Of 217 citizens of Aurora, Pembina, and other counties of Dakota.

By Mr. HERMANN: Of 84 citizens of Linn County, Oregon.

By Mr. LAIRD: Of 143 citizens of Seward, Adams, Fillmore, and Thayer Counties, Nebraska.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. TURNER: Of W. B. Womble and others, citizens of Cuba, Ga.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of the Supervising Architect that \$18,000 be appropriated to complete approaches to the Santa Fé (N. Mex.) court-house; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek, in the city of Michigan City, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.; and

A bill (H. R. 8343) to authorize the construction of a wagon and foot-passenger bridge across the Noxubee River at or near Gainesville, in the State of Alabama.

The bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 6232) for the relief of Nancy G. Alexander was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to give notice that immediately after the morning business is over I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair presents the petition of John Pope Hodnett, of Washington, D. C., praying for an investigation of his claims to payment for services as counsel for the workmen of the District of Columbia in the investigation of 1874; which will be referred to the Committee on Claims, if there be no objection.