

with England for our share of the cotton goods trade of the world. Henry Clay said in the senate in 1832—sixty years ago—

I have before me another statement of a practical and respectable man, well versed in the flannel manufacture in America and England, demonstrating that the cost of manufacture is precisely the same in both countries.

Are we less independent because of the protection we have had? Mr. J. B. Sargent of New Haven, has been engaged for thirty years in the hardware business, being one of the largest manufacturers in the world of locks, bolts, builders' and furniture hardware, and, in certain lines, of carpenters' tools. He employs from fifteen hundred to two thousand men. He has nearly 12 acres of ground under roof. His daily output is nearly 50 tons of goods per day. He says, in regard to the cost of manufacturing in this country:

American manufacturers can successfully compete in any market where skilled labor is the test, in spite of the low pay for which men work in China, in India, and in every country where labor is debased. My observation has taught me that the greatest obstacle to American competition in foreign markets to nearly every class of goods is the high price of our raw material. Take off the duty and we will send our goods everywhere. Wages would increase here under such a system rather than become lower.

Now these are the statements, cool and unimpassioned, of officials and men in position to know. I submit to you my friends that those statements are amply borne out by the illustrations of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Dingley) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Walker) when they tell you that notwithstanding the greater wages paid, the actual product in this country is cheaper than it is in Europe. If that be true, then where is your need of protection? If that be true, then who can justify the imposition of a tariff on the ground that it is necessary to protect the laboring men in this country?

Mr. Chairman, the laborer has been used as a cat's paw to draw chestnuts out of the fire for the manufacturer. The manufacturer comes here and pleads for a protective tariff in order that he may give employment with remunerative prices to labor. You give him the protection he asks; you make him a trustee for the benefit of his employe; you give to that employe no law by which he can enforce his trust. The manufacturer goes back to his factory and puts in his pocket the bonus you have given him. And then the employe pleads, and pleads in vain, for his portion of the promised benefits.

I will tell you a story. I do not know whether you allow stories here (cries of "Go on!"), but there is a story which to my mind illustrates this point. A white boy said to a colored boy, "Let's go into cohoots and go a coon hunting; you furnish the dog and climb the tree, and I'll do the hollering." They went. The white boy "hollered;" the colored boy furnished the dog and climbed the tree. They caught three coons. When they came to divide the white boy took them all. The colored boy asked, "What am I going to have?" "Why," said the white boy, "you get the cahoots."

Mr. Chairman, the manufacturer has been making just such a combination of partnership with his employe. The manufacturer says to his workmen, "You come on and furnish the dog and climb the tree; you bring out the votes; and I will do the talking." They get their coons—they have been getting them. But when the division comes, the manufacturer takes the coons, and the employe is compelled to

put up with the "cahoots." Yes, and when the employe asks for the higher wages that were promised him last year, you find Pinkerton detectives stationed to keep him off and foreigners brought in to supply his place.

Why do we need a contract-labor law? It is to prevent the protected industries of this country from sending abroad to get cheap labor to take the place of American labor. Is not that the result? Were we not promised last year just what the gentlemen from New York tell us today will still come by and by? The "sweet by and by" has been the hope of the people for these thirty years; the "present" has been the enjoyment of the men who made the promises.

We were told of the number of laborers to be employed because of the McKinley bill; yet scarcely had the bill passed when there appeared in New York an advertisement for laborers to make tin plate; and the point of it was the statement that they would be paid higher prices than laborers were paid in Wales. Why was that stated in New York, except with a view to having that paper sent to Wales and importing here the labor to make these goods?

No, my friends, the manufacturer has not dealt fairly and honestly with the employe. What has been the result? Who has been getting the benefit? Is it the great mass of our people? Are they the ones that have profited by this transaction? If, Mr. Chairman, you undertook, by the method proposed awhile ago, to raise money by passing around a hat in this body for some protected friend or some one you wished to benefit, what would be the result of your efforts? If you passed it often enough you would get all the money we had in our pockets, and the man to whom you gave it would have all you collected; and if we did not get out of money it would be because while you were emptying the hat we would be scratching around to get the next contribution ready, while the man to whom you gave it would get rich without having to scratch at all. Thus this system has operated. You have built up wealth in this country to a degree unparalleled in the history of the United States or of the world.

These men tell us that they cannot live without the collections they make; and yet they are the ones who build their stately palaces, who give their banquets, which rival in magnificence the banquets of ancient times. These are the men who can gather around a banquet board as they did, I think it was in New York, to celebrate "home industries" at \$10 per plate, when within a stone's throw of their banquet hall were people to whom a 10-cent meal would be a luxury. Yes, sir, you take the statistics furnished by Mr. Sherman in the Forum, and he shows that 25,000 people own one-half of the wealth of this country, and 65,000,000 of people divide the other half between them.

If, Mr. Chairman, you should ask the friend receiving the contributions which you were supposed a moment ago to gather here and give to him, I presume he would tell you it was the best system of government ever invented. I am not surprised that a man like Mr. Carnegie is willing to write articles in monthly magazines to show what a great benefit a protective system is. But, Mr. Chairman, I ask you whether the people who pay this money believe that it is a good system? You went before them a year ago; you took your idea of protective tariff with you, and said to them: "This, gentlemen, is the way we bring relief to the people." You said in your report "agriculture is depressed," and then you applied as a remedy the earliest principle known to surgery, "Bleed him again."

Under our protective party banner you went to the country and boasted

that you had fastened on the people a law which they could not change for ten years. But you were as ignorant of the power of the people as you were careless of their welfare. You say that we deceived them; that we exceeded you in misrepresentation. You have the consolation of knowing that if we did it was the first time we ever went beyond you in that respect. But we did not. Because as a successful fabricator the average republican will be recognized as one the latchet of whose shoes we are unworthy to unloose.

No; the people knew what you were doing; they knew what you had done, and they rose in their might and hurled you from power; and today the once proud republican party, that used to take the election of president as a matter of course, thinks it worth while to announce to this body through the gentleman from New York (Mr. Raines) that the republican party has made a gain in supervisors in New York.

Mr. Raines. Let me suggest to the gentleman that all the people are getting as a result of the change is free wool, free binding twine, and free cotton ties.

Mr. Bryan. I only hope, Mr. Chairman, that what the gentleman says is true, and that they will get these things. I hope that the body at the other end of this capitol, which differs from us in the political complexion of its majority, will not stand between the people and this relief.

Yes, sir; they boasted that nothing could be done; that they had the people bound hand and foot. Where are those conspirators today? Where are the men who were the most largely instrumental in fastening that iniquitous legislation on this country? When they went back to their people the expression of confidence was in the other man.

Mr. Raines. One of them is governor of Ohio.

Mr. Bryan. Yes; I believe he did succeed in being elected governor of a republican state.

Mr. Davis. By a minority vote. Mr. Bryan. Yes, by a minority vote. And to such extremity has this great Caesar come that he welcomes the holding of a republican state now more than before he boasted of the conquest of an empire. We do not feel unkindly toward our friend from Maine, the ex-speaker, although he seems more sensitive to remarks now than when in the chair. And he has rather contradicted the statement that the "leopard cannot change his spots," or a person his skin. He seems to have made some kind of an exchange by which he got one much thinner than the one he wore two years ago.

A Member. A thinner hide. Mr. Bryan. We shall not find fault with him if he consumes much of his time, as he gazes around upon the chairs once occupied by his faithful companions, in recalling those beautiful words of the poet Moore:

'Tis the last rose of summer, left blooming alone.
All her lovely companions have faded and gone.
No flower of her kindred, no rose-bud is nigh
To reflect back her blushes, or give sigh for sigh.

And it is barely possible that the great revolution which began a year ago may some time reach even to the coast of Maine; and for the good of the country, but perhaps for the injury of our party—because he has been a faithful friend to us, and in the language of another noted gentleman from Maine, "has done us a great favor without knowing it."

Mr. Wheeler of Alabama. Without intending it.

Mr. Bryan. The time may come, I say, when his constituents will address him in the language of that other

verse, as beautiful in words and as appropriate in sentiment—

I'll not leave thee, thou lone one,
to pine on the stem;
Since the lovely are sleeping, go
sleep thou with them.
Thus kindly I scatter thy leaves
o'er the bed
Where thy mates of the garden lie
scentless and dead.

Mr. Chairman, some reference has been made to the effect of a protective tariff upon manufactured articles, and the argument has been advanced that the aim and results are to reduce the price of protected articles to the consumer. I want to say to you that such was never the intention of a protective tariff upon the part of those who supported it; and that if the price is reduced, it comes as the effect of improved machinery, and not as the effect of a law which enables the manufacturer to sell here protected from competition, while he often sells abroad in competition with the world. The gentleman will tell us that goods are cheaper today than they were thirty years ago. It is true. But if protection did it, let him explain why it is that not only here, where we have protection, but in England, where they have free trade, goods are cheaper than they were before.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Walker) told us that steel rails had fallen in price because of a protective tariff.

I will append to my remarks a schedule given by Mr. Carlisle in an article in the Forum, in which he shows the price of steel rails in England from 1871 to 1882, and the price of steel rails in this country during that time, and the amount consumed. This shows what the Englishmen paid for them, and also what the American paid for the same amount of rails. And when you add up the difference you find that in these ten or eleven years the American people paid \$159,000,000 more for their steel rails than the English people paid. And yet you say that protection makes them cheaper.

During all that time they were cheaper in England. Is your system such a one that it will take hold of a price and pull it down in this country, and then, not satisfied with that, go over to some foreign country, grab the price there and pull it down? And then, not satisfied with that, will it pull down the price in foreign countries more than it pulls it down in this country? Some one has said that the onion is a vegetable that makes the man sick who does not eat it. It would seem that protection does the greatest good to the country that does not have it.

Until you explain what it is that reduces the price of steel rails and other manufactured products, not here alone but all over the world, you cannot attribute it to a protective tariff; but you must attribute it rather to the inventive genius that has multiplied a thousand times, in many instances, the strength of a single arm, and enabled us to do today with one man what fifty men could not do fifty years ago. That is what has brought the price down in this country and everywhere, and so far from the protective tariff helping it, it has stood as a bar and prevented us, step by step, from taking advantage of the inventive genius of other countries. It has compelled us, each time and all the time when it has benefited the protected industry, to pay more for those same things than the people elsewhere.

I asked my friend from Maine (Mr. Dingley), when he was telling us of the benefits of protection, if a man in this country bought his goods as cheaply as in England, and he said while we might get them at a higher price in dollars, that we got them cheaper in labor, and that labor was the only standard of measurement. I asked whether, if the farmer in