

framed to meet conditions, and we find now that infants that could get along on 10 per cent when they were born, and 20 per cent when they were children, and 30 per cent when they were young men, have required 40, 50, 60, or 70 per cent when old and entering upon their second childhood.

Therefore they had to frame new arguments. What is the argument advanced now? It is that the conditions in this country are such that we cannot compete with other countries, and that therefore we must put upon the imported article a tariff making the price so high that we can afford to produce the article in this country. Do they say that they need a protective tariff to help the sheep industry get upon its feet? Not at all. Mr. Lawrence in his speech said in regard to the impossibility of competing:

"And these are the existing conditions. In Australia merino wool can be and is produced at a less cost than it can be in the United States, because (1) pasturage can be had there for a few cents an acre, and (2) the climate there is such that substantially no winter feeding is required. The same is true of South America."

We are even assured by the same high authority that "wool growers should at the first practical moment demand gradually annually increasing duties on all classes of wools just as our increasing flocks can supply increasing demands." A modest demand! They offer no hope of reduction. In discussing protection our friends are in the habit of claiming everything possible. Why, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Dingley) stated to us seriously that the tariff on wool had made more pounds of wool grow on a sheep's back.

That is in the Record, that protection is responsible for the fact that the sheep today produce more wool than they used to. I have often thought how perplexed the sheep must have been after the passage of the last bill when they got together and consulted among themselves as to how they were going to increase the amount of their wool now that the tariff had made it necessary. But nobody, Mr. Chairman, has said to this house that protection would reduce the price of pasturage in this country, nor has anybody claimed that it would so moderate the climate as to do away with the necessity for winter feeding. The theory, Mr. Chairman, upon which this is justified might as well be met here as anywhere; and I want to state, as emphatically as words can state it, that I consider it as false in economy and vicious in policy to attempt to raise at a high price in this country that which we can purchase abroad at a low price in exchange for the products of our toil.

It was said by a gentleman who appeared before the committee—I think at the last congress—that wool could be raised in Australia for 6 cents a pound, and that it could not be raised in this country for less than 15 cents; and we are told that it is a wise policy to so tax imported wool as to enable our people to raise wool at 15 cents a pound instead of buying it at 6 cents a pound; that we save money and give employment to labor. If that principle is true, then it is wise to raise wool at 15 cents a pound instead of buying at 3 cents, because we save more in labor. If it is wise to raise it at 15 cents a pound instead of buying it at 3, it is still wiser to raise it at 15 cents rather than have somebody give it to us.

That is what it leads to; and the gentlemen who maintain that position are fit companions for the people who are supposed by Bastiat to have petitioned the French legislature to find some way of preventing the sun from shining because it interfered with the business of the candle-makers. If their theory is true, then the most unkind act of the Creator was to send

that great orb of day every morning to chase away the shadows of the night, flood all the earth with his brightness, and throw out of employment those who otherwise might be making tallow candles to light the world.

It was said by a French writer that Robinson Crusoe was a protectionist; that when he was on the island all alone he started to make a canoe by hollowing out a log with a broken stone. Just about the time he commenced, some boards floated up to the shore, and the thought came to him, "I will take these boards and make myself a canoe out of them;" but the protective idea came to him, and he said, "No; if I do that I will lose the labor I put into the log." So he kicked the boards away from the shore, and went on hacking at the log with the broken stone. A little later, when he and Friday were together, they spent four hours in the morning gathering fruit, and four hours in the afternoon catching game; some one came up from another island and said, "Oh our island we have lots of game but no fruit; we will bring you all the game you can catch in four hours for the fruit you can gather in two hours." "Let us do it," said Friday. "Oh, no," says Crusoe, "if we do that, what will we do with the other two hours of labor?"

And that is the theory of our friends. When we buy something, we buy with the results of our toil; and they tell us that we must not so arrange the laws of this country that we can buy a great deal, but that we must so arrange them as to make us work just as long as possible upon every piece of work we undertake. It is the old theory, "the maximum of toil and minimum of product." If this is the true principle, then discard your riding cultivators, go back to the crooked stick, and let us plow in such a way that all the people of this country can find employment in plowing alone.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, denounce as fallacious, as unworthy of consideration, the only reason that can be given in support of the tariff on wool, as a protective tariff and for protective purposes.

I desire now, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of this committee to another bill, known as the "binding twine bill." This bill places upon the free list the various kinds of binding twine. The majority and minority of the committee agree upon some of the facts. We agree that there were consumed in this country last year about 100,000,000 pounds of binding twine. We agree that if a tariff of seven-tenths of 1 per cent is added to the price of the binding twine it costs the people of this country \$700,000 because of that tariff.

We agree also that no twine was imported and that no revenue was received by the government from this source. Therefore, if this was a tax upon the consumer, it was a tax of \$700,000 taken out of the people's pocket, not one cent of which reached the treasury. According to the republican idea, that is an ideal tariff; it embraces the maximum of burden with the minimum of revenue. Follow out that principle, arrange your schedules upon that plan, and there will not be a dollar derived for the support of government from a tariff upon imports, because you will have no imports, and you must find some other source of revenue. I want to ask the gentlemen who represent the minority if they are in favor of applying this principle to the other schedules; if they are in favor of so adjusting the tariff as to prevent imports and yet enable the protected manufacturer here to take the money out of the people's pockets?

I desire to call attention briefly to what this principle involves. It is supposed that a tariff is levied because we need revenue. I heard the gentleman who led the majority in the last congress in the tariff discussion, Mr. McKinley, in a speech which he made

at Ottumwa, Ia., say that were it not for the necessity for revenue there would be no justification for a tariff upon imports. Therefore, the idea is that you levy the tariff to collect revenue to support your government.

Now, how ought it to be done? Suppose you should apply this principle in collecting the taxes for your counties and your towns. It is estimated that on an average for every dollar brought into the treasury by import duties \$1 go into the pockets of the protected industries. What does that mean? It means that 80 per cent of the taxes paid by the people for the support of the general government because of import duties goes into the pockets of the protected interests, and only 20 per cent goes into the public treasury, 80 per cent being absorbed in collecting the tax. Try that in your counties.

How many of your counties would permit the collection, by direct taxation, of \$100,000 in taxes when only \$20,000 were needed for revenue? How many of you would pay \$80,000 to some man to collect the \$20,000 that you wanted to use? And yet, Mr. Chairman, according to the principle involved in this particular item, we pay not 80, but 100 per cent for collection! Seven hundred thousand dollars are collected from the people in this case if it is a tax, not one cent of which gets into the treasury. Are the gentlemen who represent the minority going to justify that? I am anxious to hear upon what principle that can be defended.

But the minority say:

"So that, if this assumption were true, the entire additional cost would only amount to 1 cent per acre, or less than 1 mill per bushel of grain, and yet the saving of this trifling sum is the excuse given by the majority," etc.

We had a report from one of the manufacturers of binding twine that there are thirty-five binding twine factories in the United States (there are possibly a few more). If that is true, then \$700,000 a year means \$20,000 to every one of these binding twine factories. Is that a trifling consideration? It is trifling to the farmer to be taxed 1 cent an acre, but it is a matter of some importance (which the minority seems to think of more consideration) that it means \$20,000 a year to every binding twine manufacturer in this country. This tax is a small matter, Mr. Chairman; 1 cent an acre is trivial; the total sum is not great; but if you concede the right of government to collect from the farmer 1 cent an acre in order that a binding twine factory may make \$20,000 a year more, you concede the right of government to collect from that farmer 1 cent an acre on each of two hundred additional items for the "protection" of other industries, until you have absorbed every cent of his income from his farm. They told us the other day that there are twenty-five hundred articles upon the tariff list.

Now, if there are twenty-five hundred articles upon that list, and you can take one at a time and deal with it upon this principle, imposing a tax of 1 cent an acre upon the farmer for each article, then you can impose an aggregate tax of \$25 an acre upon the farmer for the benefit of somebody else. This binding twine tax is a trifling consideration, but the farmers of this country who have been oppressed, who have been made to bleed at every pore by your infamous system, will welcome even a trivial advantage as an earnest of that complete relief which will come when it is in our power to give it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention now to two inconsistent sentences that lie side by side in the report of the minority. I call attention to them not because inconsistent sentences are at all rare in arguments in defense of protection. You cannot take an hour's speech in defense of a pro-

ductive tariff without finding there contradictions standing face to face. But I call attention to these inconsistencies for the purpose merely of showing the confusion into which those are led who attempt to prove that you can benefit one man by legislation without taking something from somebody else. Here is the first sentence:

It is evident, however, from the report of the bureau of statistics that nothing has been added to the price during the past year on account of this duty.

And here is the next sentence:

It is also evident from the circular of the Belfast Rope company, limited, that to remove the tariff is to transfer the entire industry to other countries.

Here are two estranged products of one mental effort yearning for reconciliation. Now, if the first statement is true, that no part of this duty was added to the price, then how is the last part true that the removal of the duty is going to transfer all this industry to some other country? There can be no reconciliation of those propositions, because the only way in which you can drive out the manufacturing industry from this country is to so reduce the price of the article competing from abroad that manufacturers in this country cannot afford to make it; and if you say that the tariff was not added to the price, you say that the price was just as low as without the tariff; and when you say that the price was just as low with the tariff as without the tariff, then you say it makes no difference to the manufacturer in this country whether he has a tariff or not.

But I want to call attention to the alarm on the part of the minority of the committee.

There was a circular sent by some twine manufacturing establishment to the bureau of statistics and by it sent to us in the committee room; and this circular offering to sell twine is made the excuse in this minority report for retaining a tax of \$700,000 on the farmers of this country. I suppose that if some other man had sent a circular—if we had two circulars instead of one—the minority of the committee would have wanted to double the tariff and to collect \$1,400,000 from the farmers. This shows how readily they become alarmed when the interests of a manufacturer are at stake, and how slow they are to become alarmed when the interests of the great consuming masses of this country are at stake.

Another thing. In this report they say—

If it is true, as stated in a report of the majority, that the senate in 1890 voted to place this article on the free list—

"If it is true?" They will not believe the records of congress. If it is true, then they say:

—it was induced largely by the assumption that the price was then regulated by a trust and combination formed with a view to force up the price; but this condition of affairs which was then proven never to have existed is certainly impossible under present competition.

They tell you that the vote in the senate was taken upon a false assumption—the assumption of a condition which did not then exist and which is impossible—and yet the minority of this committee have in their possession a letter of Edwin H. Fittler & Co., saying that twenty-nine out of thirty-five of these factories are controlled by the National Cordage company, and that this company controls 60 per cent of the total output. Yet in spite of the fact that they know of the company, its name and location, and the number of factories which it controls, they tell you in this report that that vote was taken upon a supposed condition which not only did not exist,