

protect an industry. You can give it a bounty out of the federal treasury, or you can authorize it to take up the collection itself. This is the only difference. Suppose that the chairman desired to help some particular industry—for instance, one in the home of my friend from New York (Mr. Raines), who has asked the question. He might do it in either of two ways. He might pass around the hat here and collect the money and turn it over to the favored industry, or he might simply say to the man, "I will put a tariff upon the imported article and make the price so high that you can collect the additional price for your home-made article."

Now, what is the difference except that in the one case the chairman passes around the hat and turns the money over to his friend, and in the other case he authorizes the friend to pass the hat himself.

Mr. Perkins. May I ask the gentleman one question to clear up a matter in my own mind?

Mr. Bryan. Certainly; I will be very glad to clear my friend's mind.

Mr. Perkins. Are you to be understood as opposed to a state or national protection to be extended to the beet sugar industry?

Mr. Bryan. I am, most assuredly. And when it is necessary to come down to congress and ask for a protection on a bounty for an industry in my own state which I should refuse as wrong to an industry in another state, I shall cease to represent Nebraska in congress. The difference between a protective tariff and a bounty is simply a difference of form.

In the one case it is open and visible, and in the other it is secret and hidden. There is the difference between a bounty and a protective tariff that the Bible describes when it speaks of the "Destruction that wasteth at noon-day, and the pestilence that walketh in darkness." It is the difference between the man who meets you upon the highway, knocks you down and takes what you have, and the man who steals into your house in the night while you are asleep and robs you of your treasures; and if I had to make choice between the two I should consider the highway robber the more honorable, because he does what he does openly and before the world.

Mr. Catchings. And he incurs some little personal danger.

Mr. Bryan. Yes, he also incurs some personal danger. The great advantage of a protective tariff over a bounty is that it is not seen, and, as some one has said, its greatest justification is that by means of it you "can get the most feathers off the goose with the least squawking."

Just a word, Mr. Chairman, on the subject called up by my friend from Iowa (Mr. Perkins). I stated that I was not in favor of the sugar bounty. I was opposed to its being given in my own state; was in favor of its being repealed in my own state; and when the representative of those industries was here the other day I told him that he could rely upon me to vote for the repeal of the bounty on sugar at every stage in committee or house. And in taking that position, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I represent the great mass of the people, who cannot come to this congress and lobby bills through in behalf of private interests, who cannot get together and petition us, but whose only petitions fall into the ballot box when they vote, and, so help me God, I will be guided by those petitions just as long as I hold this office. When that bounty was put on, it was opposed in this house as unconstitutional.

I will read at this point from a decision of the United States supreme court, 20 Wall., 657:

To lay with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individ-

uals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called a taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. The merchant, the mechanic, the inn-keeper, the banker, the builder, the steamboat owner, are equally promoters of the public good, and equally deserving the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to the importunities of two-thirds of the business men of the city or town. Now I desire to ask my friend from Iowa (Mr. Perkins), does the supreme court state the truth, or are you in favor of a bounty on sugar.

Mr. Perkins. If the gentleman desires an answer I will give it. I do not live in Nebraska; I had no part in the legislation of that state placing a bounty on sugar. I do know, however, that in the state of Nebraska and in the state of Iowa this "highway robbery" principle which the gentleman denounces is largely observed and applied in all our communities.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will confine that statement to the district which he represents, and not extend it to our state.

Mr. Perkins. I say, Mr. Chairman, that that is true in the city of Lincoln and in the city of Omaha, as well in the city of Sioux City. I know that those communities are always glad and anxious to improve every opportunity to give a bounty to get a material industry into their midst. It is upon that principle that that great western country has been built up and developed as it has been, and we apply the same principle in the government of this great country.

Mr. Harris. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. Perkins. I am not speaking in my own time.

Mr. Bryan. You are welcome to all the time you want if you will talk in that way.

Mr. Perkins. I have answered your question.

Mr. Bryan. But the gentleman has not presented an illustration of the principle for which he contends. I want him to point to an instance where the city of Sioux City, or the city of Lincoln, or any other city, has voted money raised by taxation to aid a private enterprise.

Mr. Perkins. I can say for my own city that we voted a tax to build railroad machine shops there on account of the labor and money that they would bring into the community and we did it not as a benefit to the railroad company, but as a benefit to Sioux City. There is one illustration, and I can give more.

Mr. Bryan. If the gentleman will read the decision of the supreme court which I have cited he will find that the court in discussing that question say that in every instance where a vote of bonds to aid a railroad company has been justified it has been justified upon the ground that a railroad is a public and not a private improvement. And, so far as I know, there is no instance on record where the courts of any state in the United States have declared a bonus given to a purely private industry to be constitutional and legitimate.

Mr. Perkins. Take the matter of the beet sugar industry. The gentleman knows that communities in Nebraska have given aid for the establishment of factories for that industry.

Mr. Bryan. I will state to the gentleman that that was attempted in the case that came to the supreme court

of our state from Neligh. I had the honor to be one of the attorneys in the case and filed a brief against the bonds. The court held that the bonds voted were illegal.

Mr. Harris. I was going to ask my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Perkins), a question; perhaps the gentleman from Nebraska can answer it. Do you think it will make the trees grow to give a bounty upon maple sugar?

Mr. Bryan. I do not know, but I suppose it is perfectly in harmony with the "infant industry" plan that was presented in the McKinley bill and previous bills. They protected the "infant industry" of boring holes into trees.

On this question, I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of the democratic party is not hostility to industries. We welcome to this country every industry that can stand upon its feet; but we do not welcome the industries that come to ride upon our backs. We do not desire to discourage industries; we desire to restore to them the "lost art" of self-support. We are not objecting to "infant industries," but what we do say is that the public treasury shall no longer stand sponsor for the cradle of every "infant industry" born upon American soil.

But, Mr. Chairman, to resume. I have said that the purpose of the protective tariff was to transfer money from one man's pocket to another man's pocket. I want to show to you and to this committee that it is the only purpose a protective tariff can possibly have. Why do you impose a tariff? You impose it upon the theory that you cannot produce in this country the article which you protect as cheaply as it can be produced abroad; and you put the tariff upon that article in order that the price of the article may be so much increased that our people can afford to produce it. You mean that the man who buys that article shall pay into the public treasury the tariff upon the article, and you expect that this, together with the price, will be sufficient to protect somebody else.

Is not that the purpose? If not, why did the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Boutelle) ask to have the tariff taken off of building material when Eastport, Me., was burned, or why give to the snipbuilders of Maine free building material, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Turner)? How do you protect the wool grower except on the theory that foreign wool is made higher? But why do you make a man pay more for the foreign article? It is in order that your protected manufacturer may charge more for his product than he could charge without the tariff. That is the only justification; because if you say that you cannot produce the article as cheaply in this country as it is produced abroad, what benefit is it to have the outside article increased in price if you do not increase the price of the home article also?

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Dingley) says that a couple of years ago he purchased a piece of calico in Manchester, England, and paid 5 cents a yard for it; that the tariff on calico was 4 cents a yard, and that if the tariff were a tax it would make the price 9 cents; but that, on the contrary, his wife purchased in a store in this city, a piece of calico of better quality for 5 cents a yard. Now I wish to ask you this: If you can produce and sell in this country a yard of calico at the same price per yard at which it is sold in England, the American calico being of better quality, why do you want a tariff of 4 cents a yard to protect your calico?

I make this proposition: Either a tariff is needed or it is not needed. If a tariff is needed, it is in order to add the amount of the tariff to the price of the home article to enable the American manufacturer to compete with the foreign. If it is not needed, who is

going to justify it? Now, which horn of the dilemma will you take? Will you say that this tariff is needed and used; or will you say it is not needed and ought to be abolished?

If, then, that is the purpose of a tariff—to make the man who buys the protected article pay more for that article than he would pay without the tariff—it means simply this, that the law should transfer so much money from my pocket to the pocket of somebody else. You cannot, my friends, raise in this way an "infant industry" without putting the burden somewhere. Whenever you see the government by operation of law send a dollar singing down into one man's pocket, you must remember that the government has brought it crying up out of some other man's pocket. You might just as well try to raise a weight with a lever without a fulcrum as try to help some particular industry by means of taxation without placing the burden upon the consumer.

Back in Illinois when we were repairing a rail fence, we would sometimes find a corner down pretty low in the ground, and not wanting to tear down the fence we would devise a way of raising that fence corner to put under it a new-ground chunk. How did we do it? We took a rail, put one end of it under the fence corner, then laid down a ground chunk for a fulcrum. Then we would go off to the end of the rail and bear it down; up would go the fence corner—but does anybody suppose there was no pressure on that fulcrum?

That, my friends, illustrates just the operation, as I conceive it, of a protective tariff. You want to raise an infant industry, for instance; what do you do? You take a protective tariff for a lever, and put one end of it under the infant industry that is to be raised. You look around for some good, fat, hearty consumer and lay him down for a ground chunk; you bear down on the rail and up goes the infant industry, but down goes the ground chunk into the ground.

The reason our friends justify the principle is that they see the infant industry rise, but they forget the men upon whom they are placing the burden. And the trouble with this country is that all over the land are the homes of forgotten men—men whose rights have been violated and whose interests have been disregarded in order that somebody else may be enriched. It is the principle that is involved in this little binding twine bill. You see the industry that gets the \$20,000, but you never think of the farmers who go down into their pockets and pay the little sums that make up the great amount. Is not that a fact? Is not that the effect of the tariff? Therefore, the man who justifies protection as a principle must prove three things: He must prove that the principle is right; that the policy is wise, and that the tax is necessary.

I desire to say that no man on that side of the house in this session of congress will stand up before you and justify a law that takes from one man one cent and gives it to another man if he will admit that that is the operation. Take an illustration: Here are ten men owning farms side by side. Suppose that nine of them should pass a resolution, "Resolved, That we will take the land of the tenth man and divide it among us." Who would justify such a transaction? Suppose the nine men tell the tenth man that he will get it back in some way; that it is a great advantage to live amongst nine men who will thus be better off, and that indirectly he gets an advantage from the transaction?

How long do you suppose it would be before they would convince that man that they were right in taking his land? Would you, gentlemen, dare to justify that? You would not justify the taking of one square foot of his land. If you do not dare do that,