

PROTECTION TO FARMERS.

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. WYATT AIKEN,

OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1882,

UPON THE AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.



WASHINGTON.

1882.

SPEECH  
OF  
HON. D. WYATT AIKEN.

---

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. VALENTINE. I now move, Mr. Chairman, to proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 4466, making appropriations for the Agricultural Department, it being a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The title of the bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. No. 4466) making appropriations for the Agricultural Department of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes.

Mr. VALENTINE. It now being somewhat late, and so much of the day having been spent in the consideration of the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the bill has been read by its title, and the first business in order would be the reading of the bill, unless by consent the first formal reading be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill as soon as possible; and I do not believe it necessary that any general debate should be entered into upon the bill, it being simply an appropriation bill for the Agricultural Department. I am advised, however, by some gentlemen present that they would like to be heard upon this or a similar bill, and I desire to say to them that there is a special order of the House for the 25th instant, when we will proceed to the consideration of the bill for the elevation of the Agricultural Department, and if my friends will reserve their speeches upon the question until that day, I think we can go along with this bill without any discussion and pass it at once. If there is any disposition on the part of members present to discuss the bill, or if any gentleman present should choose to debate it, I shall feel it my duty to ask the committee to rise for the purpose of determining that question. If, however, there are none who desire to speak upon it, then I hope we will proceed by consent, under the five-minutes rule, to consider the bill, and I held myself in readiness to answer any questions that may be asked by members as we reach the different sections.

Mr. AIKEN. If in order I move to amend the proposition of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and move that four hours' general debate be allowed upon this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina that the motion to limit debate could not be entertained in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VALENTINE. If there is a disposition to debate the bill I

SPEECH  
OF  
HON. D. WYATT AIKEN.

---

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. VALENTINE. I now move, Mr. Chairman, to proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 4466, making appropriations for the Agricultural Department, it being a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The title of the bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. No. 4466) making appropriations for the Agricultural Department of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes.

Mr. VALENTINE. It now being somewhat late, and so much of the day having been spent in the consideration of the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the bill has been read by its title, and the first business in order would be the reading of the bill, unless by consent the first formal reading be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill as soon as possible; and I do not believe it necessary that any general debate should be entered into upon the bill, it being simply an appropriation bill for the Agricultural Department. I am advised, however, by some gentlemen present that they would like to be heard upon this or a similar bill, and I desire to say to them that there is a special order of the House for the 25th instant, when we will proceed to the consideration of the bill for the elevation of the Agricultural Department, and if my friends will reserve their speeches upon the question until that day, I think we can go along with this bill without any discussion and pass it at once. If there is any disposition on the part of members present to discuss the bill, or if any gentleman present should choose to debate it, I shall feel it my duty to ask the committee to rise for the purpose of determining that question. If, however, there are none who desire to speak upon it, then I hope we will proceed by consent, under the five-minutes rule, to consider the bill, and I held myself in readiness to answer any questions that may be asked by members as we reach the different sections.

Mr. AIKEN. If in order I move to amend the proposition of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and move that four hours' general debate be allowed upon this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina that the motion to limit debate could not be entertained in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VALENTINE. If there is a disposition to debate the bill I

shall move that the committee now rise for the purpose of going into the House.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, have I an opportunity to address some remarks directly to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VALENTINE. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I am recognized. The gentleman yielded the floor and I am not disposed to yield until I have finished my remarks. I will not detain the House but a few moments. I think a half hour will be sufficient.

Mr. VALENTINE. I have moved that the committee rise for the purpose of limiting debate.

Mr. RANDALL. The motion to limit debate could not be entertained in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VALENTINE. But my motion is that the committee rise and go into the House, for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Chair will give me an opportunity of being heard on this bill.

Mr. VALENTINE. If the gentleman desires to debate the bill he will have an opportunity.

Mr. AIKEN. I intend to discuss the bill if I have to offer an amendment to every clause of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to preserve the rights of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. AIKEN. The gentleman from Nebraska is depriving both the Chair and myself of the opportunity of proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the rights of both gentlemen. The Chair understood the gentleman from Nebraska as stating that he did not wish to discuss the matter himself. The gentleman from South Carolina then rose and claimed the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman from South Carolina under the impression that the gentleman from Nebraska did not desire to proceed.

Mr. VALENTINE. I desired, as I stated, if any gentleman present wished to enter upon the general debate, that we should go into the House and determine that question, and therefore I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that I have the floor. The gentleman from Nebraska has attempted to throttle me and others, and I do not propose that it shall be done. The Chair has recognized me, and I respectfully ask to be heard. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will not deprive me of the privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs leave to protect the gentleman from South Carolina by saying that he now has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, it is neither my purpose nor desire to criticise this bill, for though I do not approve some of its provisions, it has received my indorsement, and will receive my support in its passage through the House. But I do desire to call the attention of the House to two or three of its clauses. Under the caption "purchase and distribution of seeds," (line 91,) \$80,000 are appropriated for this purpose, an amount too small to enable the Commissioner to execute the law correctly, because, of necessity, at least one-half this amount must be expended in the distribution. In another portion of this same paragraph it is ordered that "an equal proportion of one-half of all these seeds, roots, cuttings," &c., "shall be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress;" so that one-half of every variety of seeds, plants, shrubs, bulbous roots, or other articles purchased must be divided into at least 377

separate parcels. Section 520 of the Revised Statutes, organizing this Department, declares that it shall be the duty of the Agricultural Department "to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants." Now, Mr. Chairman, if any new variety of seeds or plants should be purchased by the Commissioner in this or any foreign land for distribution, one-half the amount purchased must be divided into 377 equal parts to enable each Congressman to have some one of his constituency assist in testing its value. In my judgment it would be wiser to allow the Commissioner to distribute all these seeds to practical farmers, recommended to him, if you please, by members of Congress, so that tests could be made upon a larger scale and experiments conducted in a manner worthy of reports as to results. True, if seeds are scattered in a sort of broadcast, hap-hazard way over the country, though the larger portion may fall upon stony ground, some few may be sown in good soil and bring forth an hundred-fold. But I feel assured, if their distribution were delegated to a fewer number of persons and the experiments made upon a larger scale, far better results would be obtained, and the agricultural public would be much more materially benefited.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why it should be the duty, the privilege, or the pleasure of a member of Congress to distribute seeds of any sort to any person. I do not doubt but that every Congressman is sufficiently circumspect to be familiarly acquainted with the most successful farmers in his district, even though said district be situated in the midst of one of our large cities; for who knows every man he meets, or even those he never met before, better than a member of Congress, particularly when grave results are anticipated on the first Tuesday in the following November? Why, sir, these diminutive little seed-bags, containing perhaps the one-three-hundred-and-seventy-seventh pint of some rare and valuable seed, botanically known by some unpronounceable name, doubtless familiar however to the member of Congress, are potent to effect results in the future. They are as effective as the famous tissue-ballots, which after having served the term of a patented existence (seventeen years) in Yankee-land, is reputed to have sought an extension away down in Dixie.

I make the assertion, Mr. Chairman, without the fear of contradiction, that not a member on this floor has ever purposely distributed his proportion of these seeds to those who were the most deserving, and further, that no member has ever refused them to parties applying, even though he knew they were not sowers of seed. Hence my belief, Mr. Chairman, is that the intent of the law has not been fulfilled by the mode adopted of purchasing and distributing seeds through the Department.

Under this same caption there is a paragraph which reads thus: "For experiments in connection with the culture and manufacture of tea, in the discretion of the Commissioner of Agriculture, \$5,000." An appropriation of \$5,000 was made for a similar purpose for the year ending 30th June, 1881, and another of \$10,000 for the year ending 30th June, 1882. What portion of this \$15,000 has been expended I am unable to say. I find, however, in the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture of 25th November, 1881, the following itemized account of expenses incurred by his predecessor in attempting to prepare, at least to grow, if not to manufacture tea in this country, to wit:

Surveying, \$225; furniture, \$116; iron safe, \$365; wagon and harness, \$252; salaries, labor, expense account, &c., \$3,377.11; total., \$4,335.11.

It seems that the former commissioner located the site of his future tea manufactory in the State from which I come, and down there these expenses were incurred. The present commissioner reports to the President that—

In order to ascertain the precise condition of the experiment being carried on in South Carolina, I directed on July 9 Mr. William Saunders, the horticulturist of the Department, to proceed to Summerville, and to examine the premises and to report upon the work.

Mr. Saunders executed his mission and made his report, which I, as his friend, regret he ever submitted, for it is full of living prejudice, vented spleen, and distorted facts. For instance, Mr. Saunders says: "The land leased by the Department consists of two hundred acres, most of which is covered with a heavy forest growth," and almost in the next breath says, "the soil is a poor, hungry sand," and "of a character to support only the scantiest kind of vegetation." He further reports that—

In a general way it may be stated that since 1st July, 1880, \$15,000 have been appropriated by Congress for the encouragement of tea culture. So far as is visible to the ordinary observer the only practical palpable result of expenditures from this fund is what is to be found and what has been done on this farm.

Thus creating the impression that the Government had expended \$15,000 there. Whereas, Mr. Chairman, if the items reported by the present Commissioner are the only expenditures made upon this farm (and he reports none other) the \$5,000 appropriation made by the Forty-fifth Congress has not yet been exhausted, and the \$10,000 appropriation made by the Forty-sixth Congress lies untouched in the Treasury. The climax of this report, however, is contained in the following paragraph:

The position may be fairly represented as follows: Having every reason to conclude that the locality near McIntosh, Georgia, is too far north for the production of teas which possess sufficient of strength and pungency to command the best prices, or even profitable prices, it is therefore considered proper to try the experiment at Summerville, South Carolina, which is one and a half degrees further north.

McIntosh, Georgia, is alluded to because the agent employed by the former Commissioner discovered an old tea plantation there which he cleaned up and cultivated for one year, when, Mr. Saunders tells us in his report, he plucked five crops of leaves, manufactured tea from them, and delivered the manufactured article in the market at a cost of twenty-five cents per pound. There is nothing in this that looks like failure.

Influenced, however, by this unfortunate and inconsistent report, the present Commissioner further reports that:

Acting on this advice, I have disposed of all the animals except one horse; have removed a large portion of the outfit to Washington, and have employed one person, whose duty it is to look after the growing plants.

It will be remembered that Mr. Saunders visited South Carolina in July, when every section of the State was suffering from an unprecedented drought, and when the most fertile sandy loam appeared as mere dry dust, so that it was impossible for him from a mere casual inspection of the soil to accurately assert whether or not the soil or climate was adapted to the remunerative cultivation of the tea plant. But in December last a representative of a tea house in Baltimore visited this same farm, and reported as follows:

SUMMERVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA, *December 16.*

"Where there is smoke there is fire." General Le Duc and his tea farm have been the subject of many jokes by the Northern press, and it was to ferret out the

true inwardness of the matter that I made a visit to the Government tea farm, three miles from here and twenty from Charleston. The "farm" is under the charge of Mr. Charles Vardell, a gentleman to whom much credit is due for his labors under the most adverse circumstances. He afforded me every opportunity of finding out just what was there and what was not.

The general—and when I say general I refer to the late Commissioner of Agriculture, General W. G. Le Duc—selected this particular place not so much because it was a good one for tea culture, for there are better, but because it was easy of access, and above all a fashionable resort for the people of Charleston during the summer. Then he made what appeared on the face a most advantageous bargain, for a large land-owner leased him for twenty years two hundred acres for the nominal sum of one dollar, which dollar the general had specially coined for the purpose, to be handed down, no doubt, as an heir-loom. At the end of the lease all the improvements, &c., are to become the property of the landlord.

The place itself is historic, and was the country seat of the first colonial governor. It has about thirty acres of cleared land; the rest is forest, which the general was to clear up and plant in tea. In the center of the cleared land are the ruins of the old mansion, destroyed by fire during the Revolutionary war, and near by a "lake" about one hundred by forty feet, having no outlet, and really a stagnant pool, inhabited by a solitary yet historic alligator.

The preparations for the "tea farm" commenced with the clearing out of the rubbish that covered the old foundation of the mansion, with a view of reconstructing it "just as it was," also historic, while the oldest inhabitants were hunted up and consulted as to what they thought the mansion was like. Whether these accounts were so at variance as to cast doubts over the legend and the mansion itself, or whether the discovery that were the mansion reconstructed no white man could sleep there during summer and escape the fever, is a mooted question; but certain it is that the general gave up the idea and left the ruins to their fate, while as a substitute a novel plan to escape the dreaded malaria was devised. A platform was to be erected sixty feet from the ground, upon which was to be built the "bungalow," after the idea of the India tea gardens, and quite historically correct, from whose dizzy heights the commissioned officers of the "farm" could complacently look down on the malarial ghosts vainly striving to climb to the "bungalow." Unfortunately this experiment was never carried out, and no one now knows whether a malarial goblin can climb a sixty-foot pole or not. But the "grand boulevard" was commenced, it was to come from the depot, three miles away, in a straight line, very wide and imposing, to cross the "lake" by an ornamental iron bridge and go under the bungalow. Great live oak trees were removed out of the way, no chopping down with an ugly stump left standing, but Government contract style, grubbing them up roots and all, and when a sufficient quantity of this very valuable timber was collected, a big fire was an easy way of removing it. So the "improvements" went on, and the landlord's heart was joyful.

Last March, when the tea seeds arrived from India, they were planted in the "nursery," part of which was in good soil and part in bricks and mortar. Those that fell in pleasant places have grown marvelously, and are to-day two feet high. Even those in the brick and mortar grew, and are in witness of the hardihood of the plant and what it will stand.

But alas! the general was not to be made a Cabinet officer, nor was he even to retain the place of Commissioner, and when he was replaced by Dr. Loring, that very clear-headed man of business naturally looked at the sum total of cost, and then at the tea plants. It was an easy calculation to find out how much they cost apiece, and the sum was hardly reconcilable to their value. The truth was, the doctor could not see the "improvements," could not realize the advantage to tea culture that a reconstructed colonial mansion, historically correct, with an avenue three miles long, would bestow. So he sets his foot on the whole business. He stopped the "improvements," and, as it were, put the garrison on bread and water. Now the Government tea farm lies dormant. The people here are all anxious to have the experiment tried, while the landlord is most indignant, and threatens dire vengeance on the authorities for putting an end to the general's improvements.

What will be the result of the experiment under Government patronage is hard to say; but one thing is very certain, that the tea plants are thriving in a way that we never see surpassed in China or Japan, and that the leaves will make tea equal in every respect to any grown in the world I have had the best of evidence. But will it pay? Perhaps not with the General's "improvements."

Now, Mr. Chairman, are we to be thwarted in our efforts to develop an industry because of the extravagant folly of an official? The former Commissioner doubtless had magnificent ideas upon the subject of Government improvements, but this was perhaps because of his political rearing, for he was a member of that party that claims to

be progressive in all things and which stigmatizes economy as parsimony. But, Mr. Chairman, he has gone, and let his follies be forgotten if not forgiven. We have now, perhaps, a better man at the helm, and history is repeating itself.

More than one thousand years ago the tea plant was cultivated in China and Japan, and less than a century ago it was unknown in British India. In 1840 the East India Tea Company commenced the culture of tea in Assam, and in a very few years they had expended lavishly and recklessly in the enterprise more than \$1,000,000, and when upon the verge of bankruptcy they were unable to induce the London merchants to buy their teas. A lack of pungency, not properly manipulated, inferior to the Chinese teas, were the objections urged to the East India importations in the home market. But English pluck and British perseverance were not to be deterred by such flimsy arguments; their manipulation was improved, their process of manufacture was perfected, and to-day Assam teas are higher-priced in the markets of the world than the teas of China or Japan, and nearly 40,000,000 pounds of them were imported into Great Britain last year from Assam, while scarcely a pound of it came to this country. And yet, sir, we paid to foreign merchants, chiefly English, over \$21,000,000 in gold for teas brought principally in English bottoms from China and Japan to the United States.

No, Mr. Chairman, we should not hesitate to appropriate liberally annually for the development of this new industry, for its prospects are favorable, far more so than was the development of cotton culture a century ago, and yet we export annually over \$200,000,000 worth of raw cotton and consume one-third as much in our home manufactures. It was once contended that cotton could not be successfully grown north of a degree of latitude which to-day is not far from the center-line of this great industry. Sir, within my own recollection it was an accepted conclusion that cotton could not be remuneratively cultivated in the upper portion of my own State. In 1850 the four counties of Oconee, Pickens, Greenville, and Spartanburgh scarcely produced a thousand bales of cotton each. In 1881 they exported over 50,000 bales, and have within their confines as many cotton factories as are in the remainder of the State, having erected a half dozen since the war.

Mr. Chairman, tea is a foreign product for which we pay annually more than \$21,000,000, and it passes our custom houses without let or hinderance. I would not have it dutiable, for my confidence in southern soil, southern labor, and American ingenuity and enterprise induces the belief that we can grow tea, free tea, in successful and remunerative competition with China, Japan, or British India. But, sir, if protection were asked for it would not be granted, for the policy of the American Government is not to protect the farm laborers, who in the aggregate more than quadruple all the other American laborers engaged in any and all other American productive industries combined. All productive labor is either agricultural, commercial, or manufactural. Of these three, considered in a national point of view, agricultural labor has never received a bonus from the Government. The other two have from infancy lived, moved, and had their being in the public crib. Too much fostering care, too much nursing by a paternal Government, too much national pap have stifled, surfeited, or otherwise crippled our commercial enterprises. But we are not left without hope, for (I was about to say) a wet-nurse (the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads) is on hand with an appropriation of \$2,500,000 to subsidize some com-

mercial firm to carry our mails to foreign countries. Why not open the door, Mr. Chairman, to competition on the high seas as well as on land, and let the contract to the lowest bidder? This would be the agricultural, but perhaps it is not the commercial method of inaugurating a new industry, or reviving a lost one.

However, another adjutant (the Committee on Naval Affairs) comes with a proposition to appropriate \$10,000,000 to begin with, confident that in a few years we will possess a navy of ironclads, gunboats, and torpedo boats with which we could, if occasion required, batter down the heights of Gibraltar, blow England into the German Ocean, and command the peace of the world.

But what has all this to do, Mr. Chairman, with an appropriation of \$5,000 to experiment with in establishing a tea farm? Much every way. It displays the contrast between the monetary protection given by the Government to agriculture and commerce. That is all; nothing more. But why speak here of our commerce or our Navy? Virtually we have neither, and if money will restore either or both, let them have it. As a farmer, however, I feel it incumbent upon me to expose this favoritism. We speak of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures as handmaids of each other, the three constituting a symbolic trinity of the first nation in the world to-day. Heretofore our Government has not fostered agriculture. We have protected commerce to death; and we have thrown riches in the lap of manufactures until this third handmaid has become the mistress of the land. Why, sir, manufactures no longer ask aid at the hands of the Government; they simply lay hold upon protection and retain it until they exact in one shape or another hundreds of millions of dollars annually from the pockets of the people for the benefit of a mere brigade of men. Would that I had the time now and here to review the history of our varied manufactures. It would be pleasant for me and profitable for this House. It must suffice, however, that for a few moments I trace the origin and progress of but a single one of them. To be concise I shall confine my remarks to the iron industries of the single State of Pennsylvania and state simply facts, incontrovertible facts, taken chiefly from the statistical reports from the Census Bureau, of the iron and steel protection of the United States.

Just two hundred years ago William Penn wrote of the existence of iron in "divers places" in the province of Pennsylvania. Within fifty years from that date the iron industry was firmly established, and tons of pig-iron were exported to the mother country. At once the ever-vigilant iron manufacturer of England snuffed competition in the western winds, and apprehending danger appealed to Parliament for protection. (What imitative creatures we are, Mr. Chairman!) The appeal was heeded, and that august body decreed that "the plantations should not even manufacture iron wares of any kind out of any sows, pigs, or bars whatsoever;" and that any person venturing to erect any furnace or forge in these colonies should forfeit the sum of £200 of lawful money of Great Britain.

But, Mr. Chairman, a day of reckoning for such oppressive legislation came, and in the course of time these colonies rebelled—(is that the word?)—yes, rebelled, and during their rebellion furnaces were erected, and forges were lighted thickly along the valleys of the grand old Keystone State. As investments they became handsomely remunerative, because the demand for shot and shell and manufactured iron far exceeded the supply. Men were needed for the Army, and laborers were wanted for the "iron-works," and neither demand could be adequately supplied. But that immaterial individual known

as the "genius of our institutions" was abroad in the land, and hesitated not to invent a method of keeping the furnaces in full blast, even though every citizen should be drafted to replenish the decimated ranks of the Army. Shot and shell, too, must be had at all cost. Prisoners of war were abundant and to spare. The aforesaid "genius" was competent to the task of supplying the demand on the one hand and reducing the redundancy on the other. "While others shouted for liberty he voted for slavery." Barter and exchange was his idea, and our great Government, then in its swaddling clothes, accepted the proposition, set a monetary value of £30 upon the head of every German soldier captured in the English army, and at that valuation exchanged them as laborers with the iron manufacturers for an equivalent in shot and shell. Shades of departed statesmen! is this not enough to make the great apostle of human liberty and civil rights (Thad. Stevens) lie restlessly in his grave, because this Government in his State, and almost at his very home, resorted to the cruelty of selling human beings, or of exchanging them as chattels for munitions of war?

But, Mr. Chairman, times have changed since then. Civilization has advanced apace, old things have passed away, and many things have become new. The echo and reecho, however, of the iron manufacturer's howl for protection has not been lost in the din of his own superior and unsurpassed rolling-mills. The cry is still heard, "Save me Cassius, or I sink."

No sooner had our independence been secured than the appeal for protection by the mother country from the colonies was transferred to an appeal for the same boon by the States to Congress against the mother country. The first plea was infant industry; next, protection against foreign manufacturers; and, finally, the slogan of elevation of labor was sounded, and is a continual din in our ears to-day.

Mr. Chairman, most of our industries have grown to manhood, powerful, athletic manhood, and cannot pretend to dread foreign competition. But, sir, they are as timid as a maiden lest their intelligent, thrifty, courteous laborers may be degraded by the competition of the vulgarly called pauper labor of Europe, and especially of England. The iron manufacturer of the United States proudly boasts of the condition of his labor, and of the wages paid each laborer. Why should he not, Mr. Chairman, when the people, and not he, pay all, and more than all, of these wages? Let us apply to statistics on this point:

During 1880 there were 3,781,021 tons of pig-iron produced in the United States, of which Pennsylvania produced 1,930,311 tons, or 57 per cent. of the total. The duty on pig-iron is \$7 per ton, and hence upon this single product protection enriched Pennsylvania to the amount of \$13,512,177.

During the same year the United States produced 2,353,248 tons of rolled-iron of all kinds, 46 per cent., or 1,071,098 tons of which were produced by Pennsylvania. The duty on rolled-iron is 1½ cents per pound, or \$25 per ton. Consequently protection on rolled-iron favored Pennsylvania that year, and as much annually, to the amount of \$26,777,450.

In 1880 there were produced in the United States 985,208 tons of Bessemer steel ingots. Of these Pennsylvania produced 56 per cent., or 556,314 tons. The duty on Bessemer steel ingots varies from 2½ cents per pound to 3¼ cents per pound with 10 per cent. ad valorem added. Giving this great State the benefit of any doubt as to the quality of her production, and estimating her protection upon the

lowest rate of duty, (which every one very well knows she is not entitled to;) but for argument's sake, granting that protection favored her only to the amount of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound, or \$45 per ton, and she is chargeable under this head with \$25,034,130.

In 1880 there were produced in the United States 84,302 tons of open-hearth steel ingots, of which Pennsylvania produced 44 per cent., or 37,092 tons. Rating the duty here as in the above case of steel ingots at \$45 per ton, when perhaps much of it received a duty of \$50, \$60, \$75, or even \$80 per ton, and Pennsylvania's share of protection was \$1,669,140.

Of crucible steel there were produced in 1880 in the United States 76,201 tons, of which Pennsylvania produced 79 per cent., or 60,303 tons. At the same rate of duty, \$45 per ton, Pennsylvania is protected to the amount of \$2,713,635.

In 1880 there were produced in the United States of blooms from pig and scrap iron 34,924 tons, of which Pennsylvania produced 24,446 tons, or 70 per cent. of the total. The duty upon this product is 1 cent. per pound, or \$20 per ton. Here, too, then, Pennsylvania was protected to the amount of \$488,920.

In 1880 there were produced in the United States of all kinds of rails 1,217,497 tons, and of these Pennsylvania produced 569,912 tons, or 47 per cent. Of iron rails Pennsylvania produced 157,213 tons, upon which there is a duty of 70 cents per 100 pounds, or \$14 per ton. Hence from this source Pennsylvania received protection to the amount of \$2,200,982.

In 1880 there were produced in Pennsylvania 409,339 tons of Bessemer steel rails, upon which there is a duty of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound, or \$25 per ton. Here again Pennsylvania received protection to the amount of \$10,233,475.

In 1880 Pennsylvania produced 3,360 tons of open-hearth steel rails, upon which she received a protection of \$25 per ton, or \$84,000.

In 1880 there were produced in the United States 252,830 tons of cut nails, upon which there is a duty of \$30 per ton. Of these Pennsylvania produced 75,849 tons, or 30 per cent., which yielded her a protection of \$2,275,470.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling and will bear repetition; so allow me to recapitulate, itemizing the total product of the United States, the total duty, and Pennsylvania's share of each. In the United States in 1880 there were produced as follows, in tons:

Pig-iron, 3,781,021; tariff, \$26,467,147; Pennsylvania's product, 1,930,311; protection, \$13,512,177.

Rolled iron, 2,353,248; tariff, \$58,831,200; Pennsylvania's product, 1,071,098; protection, \$26,777,450.

Bessemer steel ingots, 985,208; tariff, \$44,335,360; Pennsylvania's product, 556,314; protection, \$25,034,130.

Open-hearth steel ingots, 84,302; tariff, \$3,792,590; Pennsylvania's product, 37,092; protection, \$1,669,140.

Crucible steel, 76,201; tariff, \$3,429,045; Pennsylvania's product, 60,303; protection, \$2,713,635.

Pig-iron blooms, &c., 34,924; tariff, \$698,480; Pennsylvania's product, 24,446; protection, \$488,920.

Iron rails, 466,917; tariff, \$6,536,838; Pennsylvania's product, 157,213; protection, \$2,200,982.

Bessemer steel rails, 741,475; tariff, \$18,536,875; Pennsylvania's product, 409,339; protection, \$10,233,475.

Open-hearth steel rails, 9,105; tariff, \$227,625; Pennsylvania's product, 3,360; protection, \$84,000.

Cut nails, 252,830; tariff, \$7,584,900; Pennsylvania's product, 75,849; protection, \$2,275,470.

Total tariff on iron products in 1880, \$170,440,060; Pennsylvania's share, \$84,989,379.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask, out of whose pockets came these fabulous sums to enrich the few iron manufacturers of the United States? But let us look a little farther and investigate if we can the subject of enhanced wages.

We have no means of estimating the numbers engaged in exhuming the iron ore from mother earth. Those digging, delving, hard-working fellows are not sufficiently well paid, nor perhaps of sufficient intelligence, to be worthy of enumeration by the Census Statistical Bureau. But that other class, that well-paid, well-fed, highly-favored set who have the privilege of working in the iron manufactories of the United States, are reported as numbering 140,978, and to each of these is paid as his annual wages the average sum of \$393.51, or a total amount of \$55,476,785, or a little over one-third the total amount paid by the people to the employers in the shape of protection. Or, in other words, the iron manufacturers pay their laborers \$55,476,785 annually, while the people pay through protection to these iron manufacturers \$170,440,060. And the State of Pennsylvania, receiving through protection \$84,989,379 upon her iron production, is paid a bounty of \$29,572,594 by the consumers of her products over and above the total amount of wages paid annually by all the iron manufactories of the United States to all of their employes. Is it any wonder, then, Mr. Chairman, that our iron manufacturers are able to pay large salaries to laborers? And still less is there cause for surprise that iron manufacturers are protective-tariff men, regardless of any other phase of their political creed?

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this subject that does provoke my surprise, and that is that any sane man should attempt to prove or should even assert, as we have had it asserted, repeated, and reasserted several times in the same speech since the assembling of the present Congress, that 90 per cent. of the manufactured products of our country is labor. Strange infatuation! Unless figures lie, and unless our census statistics are a fraud, the bounty paid by the tariff to the iron manufacturers alone of the single State of Pennsylvania is more than 50 per cent. in excess of all the wages paid by all the manufacturers of iron in all parts of the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us examine another phase of this kaleidoscopic subject. In 1880 the aggregated capital invested in iron and steel industries in the United States was \$230,971,884. Of this amount \$106,247,066, or 46 per cent., were invested in Pennsylvania. What the market value of the annual product of this permanent investment is I have no means of knowing, but I do know that, be it what it may, it is enhanced in value by protection to the amount of \$170,440,060, or 70 per cent. upon the capital invested throughout the United States, and 85 per cent. upon the investments in Pennsylvania. Vulgarly the bondholder is denominated as bloated because he pays no tax upon his investment. What shall we style the man whose investment is annually enhanced in value nearly 100 per cent. by the bounty of the Government? Wise as serpents are these iron-clad protective-tariff men, for they have cajoled both their employes and this great Government into the belief that the tariff is an institution founded expressly for the protection of the laboring man. Suppose these laborers, imbued with that spirit of rebellion which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] told us yesterday he

had seen manifested in his State in opposition to the supervision required by our system of internal taxation, were to strike for a co-operative distribution of the earnings of their own labor, think you, Mr. Chairman, it would amount to no more than 35 per cent. of the bounty paid these manufacturers by the Government? In agriculture labor is frequently estimated as half the value of the product. In iron manufactures it is less than 35 per cent. of the bounty of the Government, and yet it is claimed to be 90 per cent. of the value produced. The assertion really seems farcical.

Mr. Chairman, how insatiate is the greed of humanity! Not content with their already dazzling incomes through the bounty of the Government, these iron men are attempting to increase, and doubtless will increase, the tariff upon that class of manufactured iron in which is included "cotton ties," a description of iron that affects the pockets of the greatest number of the poorest laborers of this country. These laborers are, however, all farmers, who seldom feel the helping hand of a paternal Government. The duty on cotton ties some years ago was 70 per cent. ad valorem. For some reason, not pertinent at this moment, this duty was reduced to 35 per cent. ad valorem, which is about three-fourths of 1 cent per pound. The bill familiarly known as the McKinley bill proposes to restore the 70 per cent. tax or increase the duty three-fourths of 1 cent per pound. Certainly such a tax is only a mite when imposed upon an individual farmer, but what is it when aggregated upon a cotton crop numbering millions of bales? Each bale usually has six ties around it and they weigh ten pounds, hence the levy upon each bale is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents. The crop of 1882 will doubtless aggregate 6,000,000 bales, and hence the tax on the 36,000,000 ties that bind them will amount to the sum of \$450,000. Now, sir, if this amount could be collected at our custom-houses and be then covered into the Treasury, not a farmer in the South would complain of the tax. But when we know from past experience that it will all go, or at least \$449,000 of it, into the coffers of less than a half dozen cotton-tie manufacturers of this country, we can but denounce the proposition as an effort to rob the many for the benefit of the few.

But, sir, the cotton farmer is blandly told he should not complain, for inasmuch as he buys these ties at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound or less by retail, he sells them around his bales at the net price of cotton, 9, 10, or 11 cents per pound. This plausible argument does not warrant an unjust tax. But however plausible the proposition, it is not true in fact. The price of cotton in the South is regulated by the price in New York, and the price in New York depends upon the price in the English market, which is graduated by speculation and not by supply and demand. If this Congress would or could impose the penalty of the hangman's rope around the neck of every man who dealt in what is known technically as "cotton futures," positive and direct protection would be given to the cotton planters in so far as they are defrauded by the gamblers of New York and elsewhere. But from the influence of the Liverpool market they can never anticipate protection, for English cotton buyers schedule the price of cottons as if every purchase were made of the net lint. A standard tret is deducted from every bale as it is weighed, which is an absolute loss of twenty pounds to the bale, the weight of the bagging and ties, and this loss falls directly upon the producer. Hence an increased duty upon the cotton tie would be a direct tax upon the farmer for the benefit of the manufacturer.

Mr. Chairman, there is another feature about the iron industries

of our country worthy of attention. Iron manufacturers never admit that a reduction of the tariff will injure their investment; they always assert that it will completely destroy them. Away back in 1785 the iron manufacturers of Pennsylvania petitioned the General Assembly to prevent the importation of foreign iron by a prohibitory tariff, "or there would be a total stoppage and destruction of that very useful and beneficial manufacture" in that province. From that day to this the echo of that appeal has been reverberating through these Halls, growing louder and more potent as time rolls on. A few years ago, when the duty on cotton ties was reduced from 70 to 35 per cent. ad valorem, we were assured that there would be manufactories closed up and laborers with dependent families thrown penniless upon an uncharitable world, and great suffering in consequence. That gaunt specter the pauper laborer of England was to step right in and impoverish our cotton-tie manufacturers. Alas, for these prophets, results warranted no such anticipations. On the contrary, the factories were kept busy almost night and day, the price of cotton ties to the farmer were reduced in price more than the reduction of the duty, and nobody seems to have been injured.

But, sir, this cry of "destruction to the enterprise if you reduce the tariff" seems peculiar to the vocation of manufacturing. When in the Forty-fifth Congress the duty was removed from quinine we were assured the manufacturer's occupation was gone. High-priced quinine, adulterated quinine, no quinine at all were the prognostics of the future given us by the quinine monopolists at that time. But what are the facts in the case? Two months before the repeal of that duty quinine sold in this city at \$5 an ounce, for I bought it at that price. Subsequently I bought it at \$4.25. A year ago I bought it at \$3.50. Since then it was sold for \$3, and to-day can be bought for \$3.25. We have heard of no consequent suffering, Mr. Chairman, nor of adulterated quinine, and the factories are at work, and receiving all the net earnings their labor deserves.

As with cotton ties and quinine, so it would be with pig-iron, Bessemer steel, cut nails, or any other industry now too highly protected by our tariff laws. Do not understand me, Mr. Chairman, as advocating the repeal of the tariff in toto. Certainly in this late day, when we are oppressed with that internal system of taxation which Mr. Jefferson doubtless characterized and denounced in stronger language than that attributed to him by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. KELLEY,] and when we are burdened with a heavy national debt, no reasonable man would desire to see the one repealed, the other entailed upon posterity, and our custom-house doors thrown open to foreigners to the detriment, if not destruction, of all home manufactures. I imagine such a proposition never entered the brain of the most extreme free-trader. But I do not doubt but that a majority of the thinking men of our country have contemplated and do desire a reduction of the tariff upon most of our manufactured articles. In my mind it is apparent that no protection should be given any article beyond that which would place the producer upon an equal footing with the foreign producer in the home market. For instance, 100 pounds of East India rice can be delivered in our custom-houses for \$2.90. It costs our home producers of rice \$4.33 to place a like quantity in our home market. The difference is \$1.43. To that extent I would protect the rice planter of my State and no more. The present tariff on rice is \$2.50 per hundred pounds. This is \$1.07 more than the difference in the cost of production here and production abroad, and just that much more than it ought to be,

because it is taking by law from the consumer of 100 pounds of rice \$1.07, for which no earthly equivalent is given in return. And the same rule would hold good, Mr. Chairman, with all other protected articles, and, sir, I am sanguine that with this reduction our manufacturers would not shrink from competition with all other nations, nor with the "Ishmaelite of nations."

○

It is to be noted that the amount of 100 pounds of the  
\$1.00 for which no receipt is given is retained. All the  
amounts would have been paid had the District with all other protocols  
articles and the I am assuming that with this reduction of man-  
- factors would not affect from comparison with other nations  
for with the "responsibility of nations."

