

how will you justify the taking of that which a man raises on his land, all that makes the land valuable? Where is the difference between the soil and the product of the soil? How can you justify the one if not the other?

Mr. Lind. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to another question?

Mr. Bryan. Most willingly.

Mr. Lind. I believe the gentleman from Nebraska voted for a bill the other day taxing the public at large for the purchase of text-books for children who attend the public schools. How does he justify that?

Mr. Bryan. I think, if I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, that I have also paid a little tax for the support of public schools upon the theory that it was a public purpose, and I voted to buy school books upon the same theory. If I am wrong, I will be glad to be corrected. Did the gentleman from Minnesota vote for that with the understanding that it was for a public purpose or for a private purpose?

Mr. Lind. A public purpose.

Mr. Bryan. Very well, then we agree.

Mr. Lind. But let me say in justice to myself that if the gentleman from Nebraska can convince me that a protective tariff, a protective policy, is not a public policy and beneficial to the people, and to the country as a whole, I will be a free trader with him.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I want to take him quite that far, but I wish that I could lead him to believe in a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. Raines. And with incidental protection.

Mr. Bryan. I will say this, that it makes very much difference with a man whether what has been done is the result of accident or design. If you levy a tariff for revenue, you will so arrange it as to raise a revenue and stop when you have raised revenue enough. But if you levy a tariff for protection you may so arrange the schedules as to make a heavy tax, raise but little revenue, and you never know when to stop.

Mr. Raines. Does the gentleman claim that we are getting too much revenue now?

Mr. Bryan. Perhaps not; but you have reduced the revenue by increasing the taxes upon the people and that is what I object to.

Mr. Raines. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. Bryan. Certainly.

Mr. Raines. I would like the gentleman now, in order to clinch his argument, to answer this question: Can the gentleman point to any one single article produced in the United States in competition with a foreign article that has been increased in price by the McKinley tariff, or which is not actually cheaper today than it was prior to 1860?

Mr. Bryan. I will ask the gentleman if tin is manufactured in this country?

Mr. Raines. Well, I have in my desk a list in a trade paper—

A Member. They are all on paper. Mr. Raines (continuing). A list of twenty-seven manufacturers of tin; but I want to say to the gentleman that no trade paper was ever printed that could contain a list of all the tin plate liars of the United States.

Mr. Bryan. I do not suppose that paper, then, has a biographical sketch of my friend from New York. I will say, Mr. Chairman—and it will explain why I asked my friend from New York if we had any tin industries in this country—I have here a statement that the average price of tin plate for 1888 was \$4.45 a box. The average price for five years prior to July 1, 1890, was \$4.45. The average price for 1891 was \$5.68 a box. This was given on the authority of the Tin Plate Consumers' association of the United States, which has in its ranks a large

majority of those who use tin. And I will place this on record as my authority, against the statement of the gentleman that no article could be mentioned upon which the price had been increased. And I will go further and name, if he wishes, an article upon which the price has been reduced by the removal of the tariff, namely, sugar.

Mr. Halvorson. And quinine.

Mr. Raines. I wish to call the gentleman's attention right here to the fact that in 1880 the foreign price of tin was \$8.28 a box, and the American price was \$9.36 a box, while the price in 1891 was \$5.42 a box.

Mr. Bryan. I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, for the matter of information that the gentleman has injected into the body of my remarks. If he has the statistics in regard to the price in 1870 or in 1860, or in fact if he can give me the price of tin plate in 1592 say, or 1492, it will be a matter of great interest to my people, and this speech is going to circulate among them.

Mr. Raines. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman himself seems to be the one who is indulging in ancient history.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, I am sure if I have indulged in ancient history, this house will not pardon me unless I have a better excuse than the gentleman from New York can furnish for his indulgence in ancient history. And on this point—I expected to come to it later, but it is made opportune by the remarks of the gentleman—I want to ask him if he believes the tariff upon tin plate had anything to do with the cheapening of the price of tin plate in this country?

Mr. Raines. I believe that the tariff upon tin will result in the establishment of an industry in the United States—

A Member. Answer the question.

Mr. Raines (continuing). And will result in the keeping at home of thirty millions of dollars a year that have been sent abroad, and will give employment to 100,000 men in the industry and will result in cheapening the price to the consumers in the United States.

Mr. Bryan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York may well be pardoned, as the rest of his party may be, for indulging in prophecy rather than history since 1890. But that is not an answer to my question. He stated that the price of tin plate had been reduced in the last ten years. I ask him, and I expect a direct answer and no equivocation, whether in his opinion the tariff upon tin plate has reduced (not will reduce) the price of tin plate? For that can be the only point to his remarks.

Mr. Raines. I have given my answer. When the industry of tin plate is established in the United States—and three months ago there was not a gentleman on that side who would admit that there was or would be a tin plate factory in the United States—

Mr. Bryan. We will not admit it today, sir.

Mr. Raines (continuing). When it is established in the United States the result will be just the same as it has been in the wire nail industry, for you can buy wire nails today for less than the duty on nails.

Mr. Bryan. If the gentleman does not desire to answer my first question and wants to branch off into the wire nail subject, I assure him that one of the most pleasant entertainments I had in my district last campaign revolved around a wire nail. If he prefers to refer to that, let me ask him: if he believes the reduction in the price of wire nails is due to a protective tariff?

Mr. Raines. Largely.

Mr. Bryan. How largely? What is the proportion?

Mr. Raines. In that business I am laboring under the same difficulty that your majority of the committee on

ways and means are laboring, when in their report they say it is impossible to tell in what degree the tariff does affect either the increase or the reduction of the price of an article.

Mr. Bryan. I will ask you to give your best judgment as to what proportion protection has reduced the price of wire nails and the proportion into which other things have entered?

Mr. Raines. I would like to ask the gentleman when he suggests—

Mr. Bryan. One thing at a time.

Mr. Raines. I do not desire to interrupt the gentleman without his permission.

Mr. Bryan. If the gentleman will answer my question I will continue to answer his questions as long as he puts them; but I do not want him to refuse to answer my question and then ask me a question.

Mr. Raines. I do not want the gentleman to make an answer for me.

Mr. Bryan. I will let you make an answer if you will.

Mr. Raines. I was going to make an answer.

Mr. Bryan. Then make an answer.

Mr. Raines. I was going to make an answer in this way. I was going to ask the gentleman this. When he is buying a pound of wire nails for 2.8 cents, on which the duty is 2 cents, what is he doing? Is he buying nails or is he paying duty?

Mr. Bryan. I would like to ask the gentleman if his mind is so constructed that he considers that an answer to my question? Do you consider that an answer?

Mr. Raines. A reasonable one.

Mr. Bryan. Then, I am glad to send that out to the people of Nebraska as an illustration of the astuteness of the mind of a distinguished New York republican.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can suggest to this house a reason why the gentleman from New York would not answer the question. I will give him the credit for more intelligence and less sincerity. The reason he would not answer that question is that he suspected that the next question would be: "If protection reduced the price of wire nails, and was put on for that purpose, and reduced the price of tin plate, and was put on for that purpose, why did the republican party increase the tariff on wheat? Because they wanted to reduce the price?" When a man defends a protective tariff on the theory that it reduces the price of the protected article, he wants the people of this country to believe that the manufacturer comes down to congress and begs for a tariff on his article to decrease the price of his article, and then begs for a tariff on agricultural products to increase their price.

Mr. Raines. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the gentleman that in the majority report, which he has signed, it is said that the tariff actually did reduce the price of wool. You cannot get away from that; you signed the report.

Mr. Bryan. I said, Mr. Chairman, in the beginning, that there are wool growers in this country who believe that; but the gentleman cannot dodge the logic of his position by any such subterfuge as that. The difficulty is, Mr. Chairman, that when a man gets up here to defend protection he would have you believe that the manufacturer's sole aim in life is to make his goods cheap, in order that he may pay high wages to labor; and, as he cannot get them cheap enough otherwise, he asks congress for a law to encourage competition, that he may be compelled to sell them cheaper. Now, if he is so anxious to cheapen goods to the people, why does he not simply reduce the price and not beg for a law to compel him to do it?

But, Mr. Chairman, as Plutarch would say, I digress. I was saying when interrupted that the man who defends the principle of protection

must justify the taking of one man's money and putting it into another man's pocket. He must justify the appropriation by legislation of a part of the proceeds of our daily toil to somebody else as a benefit, and yet there is this difference between the case which I cited, of nine men getting together and taking the land of the tenth man and dividing it among them by resolution, and the case of protection. In that we have one man getting together and taking the property of the nine men by resolution and dividing it among "him."

It has been said that a slave was a slave simply because 100 per cent of the proceeds of his toil was appropriated by somebody without his consent. If the law is such that a portion of the proceeds of our toil is appropriated by somebody else without our consent, we are simply to that extent slaves, as much so as were the colored men. And yet this party, that boasts that it struck the shackles from 4,000,000 slaves, insists on driving the fetters deeper into the flesh of 65,000,000 of free men.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to defend this on principle, it is equally difficult to defend it as a policy. I make this assertion, that if it is wise to appropriate money out of the public treasury to aid a private enterprise, then it is wiser for a town than for a county. It is wiser for a county than for a state. For a congress of restricted and delegated powers, whose members are far removed from the people, it is most unwise of all to vote away the public money for private purposes. So that, if that policy is wise at all, this is the last place to apply the principle.

We would not dare to trust that policy in our country or our town; and my friend from Sioux City has not pointed to an instance where it has been done at public expense. The difference between voting public money for private purposes and taking up a subscription voluntarily is so wide, that I do not believe there is a gentleman upon the other side who does not see it. Why would you not trust it at home? Because you know that there would go before that council, or before the county commissioners, only those men who want something, only those men and their paid attorneys would go there to represent the great advantage that the proposed industry would be to the community, while the other side would never be heard.

Therefore, although you walk the streets with your councilmen every day; although they are your constant companions; well as you know them, as much confidence as you have in them, you would not dare to trust them in that way, because you know that when men come to vote money for private purposes, when they come to this special legislation, there are always special influences at work on the side of the strong and powerful, while, on the other hand, those who—

Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife,

Keep—

—the noiseless tenor of their way are never heard, although it is upon them that the burden resulting from such special legislation ultimately rests. Therefore, honest as your councilmen might be, desirous of doing right as they would be, you would feel that you could not, that you must not trust them with such power. And yet gentlemen will tell you that what they would not trust to their local authorities at home, what they would not dare to approve as a local matter in Sioux City or in Lincoln, they think right and proper here.

(To be continued next week.)

A great union has been formed by railway trainmen, consisting of the railroad conductors and brakemen on roads operating west of Chicago.