

but cannot exist. And then to add to their inconsistency, after telling you that the competition in this country is such that no combination can exist (in spite of the actual fact that it does exist) they tell you a little further on that they are not willing to destroy the competition of the American manufacturer and leave the farmer entirely at the mercy of the foreign producer and importer. In other words, it is impossible for the manufacturers of this country to combine, but just take off the tariff and all the factories in the world will combine against the poor farmer of the United States.

Again, they state that if we take the tariff off, the importer will charge his per cent and the farmer will not get his binding twine any cheaper than he did before. At what straws a drowning man will catch! Why, Mr. Chairman, if it is true that the amount charged by the importer will offset the tariff, then what becomes of all this gloomy prediction that this industry is going to be destroyed in our country and transferred to foreign countries? If the importer charges an amount equal to the tariff, then the farmer will not get his twine any cheaper; and if he will not get his twine any cheaper, these men can sell at the same price, can they not? And how are they going to be run out of the market?

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another thing to be said in regard to binding twine. Complaint is made here in the last part of this minority report that the effect of the bill will be to admit free a large class of jute yarns and twine in an advanced state of manufacture and to disarrange the entire manufacture of jute goods in this country.

(Here the hammer fell.)

Mr. Burrows. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may have such additional time as he may require to conclude his remarks.

The Chairman (Mr. Ellis). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to my colleague upon the committee for his kindness and to the committee for its courtesy.

I was, when interrupted, about to call the attention of the members present to the fact that this bill puts on the free list those kinds of twine which are made in whole or in part from raw material already upon the free list. There is an apparent exception in the case of jute. Jute and jute butts are already on the free list; but what is known as jute yarn is subjected to a tariff under the present law, and the objection made to this clause in the bill is that what is known as jute yarn used in other industries may come in free as twine and disarrange the whole business in this country. I have simply this to say: we make free binding twine made of jute and these other materials. It jute yarn can be used for binding twine, we want it to come in free. If it is not binding twine, it does not come in free under this law, and we can safely trust the authorities to prevent something coming in as binding twine which is not binding twine.

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

Mr. Bryan. Very gladly.

Mr. Lind. I notice that in the report brought into this house by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Turner), a member of your committee, the machinery used in the manufacture of cotton-bagging is put on the free list. Cotton-bagging, as I understand it, is made from substantially the same material as binding twine. Now, I should like the gentleman from Nebraska to state to the committee why you put the machinery for the manufacture of cotton-bagging on the free list and not the machinery for the

manufacture of binding twine?

Mr. Bryan. That is a fair question and I am glad to answer it, as I shall be glad to answer any question that may be proposed in good faith by any of our friends on this side of the house or the other.

There is this difference: There is no doubt that the manufacture of binding twine under present conditions can be conducted in this country as cheaply as in any other country in the world, and that this tariff of seventenths of one cent per pound is absolutely unnecessary to protect the industry.

There could be, therefore, no injury inflicted upon the manufacturers by not putting the machinery for making the binding twine on the free list. I will say this, that speaking for myself, I shall be glad to put on the free list not only the machinery for manufacturing binding twine, but for manufacturing all things, for I believe it a legitimate advantage that can be given to industries in all parts of the country. I was glad when the last congress put on the free list the machinery used in the manufacture of beet sugar. My only criticism was that they did not make it broad enough to include not only the machinery used in the manufacture of beet sugar, but that used in the manufacture of all other kinds of sugar.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lind. If the gentleman will pardon me for another interruption, that does not answer my specific question. Here you put a manufactured article, specifically named, on the free list. Why not put the machinery for manufacturing that specific article also on the free list, so as to give the domestic producer at least an equal show with the foreign producer?

Now, I am not discussing or rather inquiring into the gentleman's general ideas here on this subject, but in regard to this specific article I ask why that exception is made.

Mr. Bryan. I will say this to the gentleman. That it was the object of the committee, in presenting separate bills, to as far as possible confine the discussion to these bills and to the items they embody; and if we had attempted to put on the free list the machinery by which this material now under consideration is made (I have stated that the manufacturers can compete without this advantage), then there would have been men owning machinery who would have come and complained that we ought also to put on the free list pig iron, iron ore, and other articles.

Mr. Lind. But do not the manufacturers of machinery for making cotton bagging complain?

Mr. Bryan. I do not know, but I will say in regard to machinery for the manufacture of cotton bagging, that it is very simple machinery, and is about all imported anyway. That is my understanding at least. But the gentleman will see that if we should attempt to embrace in this bill everything that can be related to it we could not confine the subject to binding twine and we would soon find some of the associates of my friend telling the people of Minnesota and Iowa that they were much in favor of this feature or that feature of the bill, but they could not vote for it altogether. Now, we want them to go on record on individual propositions, and condemn them or support them as they see fit.

Mr. Lind. And stultify ourselves.

Mr. Bryan. Well, you can do just as you please about that. But if the present system were framed with an eye to justice, entire justice, there might be some reason in opposing any change that was not entirely just in all its details and relations. But when you have a system conceived in greed and fashioned in iniquity I do not think that the question of justice can be brought in when you revise it. That

is, reform is not to be delayed until exact justice can be rendered.

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

Mr. Bryan. Certainly.

Mr. McKenna. Do you really believe that the protective policy is similar to the pickpocket's policy of putting a man's hand into another man's pocket and extracting money from it?

Mr. Bryan. Yes, that is my belief.

Mr. McKenna. Now, then, one other question. You can answer it all together. If that is so, how do you justify your position, not in economics, but in morality, for reporting a bill which leaves 39 per cent taxes on woolen clothing?

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, if I found a robber in my house who had taken all I had, and I was going to lose it all or else get one-half back, I would take the half. I will ask the gentleman from California whether he would refuse to give the people any relief because he could not give all that he wanted to give?

Mr. McKenna. No.

Mr. Bryan. Then we agree.

Mr. McKenna. No, we do not. If I was in a position of power, being a member of the committee on ways and means, and believed that my vote would relieve this country from a system of pickpocketing, I would never consent to vote for a bill in that way.

Mr. Bryan. In that respect the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Nebraska do not think alike.

Mr. McKenna. And in some other respects also.

Mr. Bryan. I am willing to take the best method that is possible, to obtain relief just as far as possible, and I will not insist upon getting it all before I consent to take any.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to a letter which I received today from the bureau of statistics. It may assist in understanding whether there is any trust in this country or not. We addressed a communication to the bureau of statistics for information upon the subject. We received a number of letters, and today I was handed two other letters which have just been received, one from the National Cordage company and one from Edward H. Fittler & Co. I want to call attention to one sentence in the letter from the National Cordage company.

The National Cordage company, erroneously termed the trust, has the power of legislating for some forty of these mills.

Now, those who believe that a trust is a "private affair," into which we should not inquire, might regard it as all right; but it seems to me that those are not accustomed to the use of the English language who can read that statement, that this company has the legislating for forty mills, and then deny that there is any combination. The Fittler company write:

We would think that the average price obtained by the manufacturer would be slightly higher than last year, when we had 20,000 tons carried over from 1890 which the large crop of 1891 consumed.

Now, there is the promise of a man outside of the National Cordage company that the chances are that the farmer will pay a little more for his binding twine this year than last year and the papers of the last few days have contained items to the effect that the advance in price has already been agreed upon; agreed upon, I presume, with a confident expectation that a republican senate will not permit the people, voting through their representatives in congress, to bring relief from this tax. But enough on that subject.

Mr. Turner. Does my friend from Nebraska remember that that body agreed during the last congress to make binding twine free?

Mr. Bryan. I do remember it, and

our report on this bill so states; and yet the minority of this committee say that it was induced by a misunderstanding, and we have been given to understand by high authority that they will not allow any bills of a tariff reform nature to pass the senate. My hope is—it is simply a hope—that when these bills go before that body their consciences will rise superior to their partisanship.

Mr. Clover. Vain hope!

Mr. Bryan. It may be a vain hope, but it is the only hope we have, until the people, speaking at the polls, carry still further the reform that was begun in 1890.

But now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the principle of protection.

As I said in the beginning, we were invited by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Dingley) to discuss it; and if I gather anything from the remarks that I hear on this side of the house, and from what has already been said, there will be no hesitation in accepting the invitation. Let us go back to the foundation of the principle. What is the object of a protective tariff? There are two kinds of tariff; a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection. In our platform of 1876, that upon which Mr. Tilden was nominated and elected, we declared, "we demand that all custom house taxation shall be only for revenue." That is the platform upon which the party stood then. That I believe is the principle of the democratic party today; and that we will approach just as rapidly as we can. Then there is a tariff for protection. That is the only tariff of which we complain.

I am not objecting to a tariff for revenue. If it were possible to arrange a system just as I believe it ought to be arranged, I should collect one part of our revenues for the support of the federal government from internal taxes on whisky and tobacco. These are luxuries and may well be taxed. I should collect another part from a tariff levied upon imported articles, with raw material on the free list—the lowest duties upon the necessities of life and the highest duties upon the luxuries of life. And then I should collect another part of the revenues from a graduated income tax upon the wealth of this country. It is conceded by all writers that a tariff upon imports operates most oppressively upon the poor. A graduated income tax would fall most heavily upon the rich, and thus the two would partially compensate each other and lessen the injustice that might come from either one alone. That, I say, would be my idea, if it were possible.

But I am not complaining at this time of a revenue tariff. What I denounce is a protective tariff, levied purely and solely for the purpose of protection. It is false economy and the most vicious political principle that has ever cursed this country.

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

Mr. Bryan. Certainly.

Mr. Raines. I want to know if the gentleman does not remember that in the democratic platform of 1876 they expressly said that it was for the protection of American industries, a tariff for revenue, and to promote industry?

Mr. Bryan. There is a question, Mr. Chairman, when you come to consider the details of a revenue tariff, as to just how it ought to be laid. I do not remember the exact language of that platform upon that question; but I do believe, as I say, and I am ready to stand by it anywhere, that a protective tariff levied not to raise revenue but to protect some particular industry is wrong in principle and vicious in practice.

Now, what is a protective tariff, and what does it mean? It is a simple device by which one man is authorized to collect money from his fellow-men. There are two ways in which you can