

WPA  
SPEECH 250 P 36

OF

HON. J. H. WALKER,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

ON

PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

IN PERSONAL DISCUSSION WITH

FREE TRADE DEMOCRATS,

WILSON, of West Virginia,

McMILLIN, of Tennessee,

CRAIN, of Texas,

HARTER, of Ohio, etc.

*Tuesday, March 15, 1892.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C.  
GEO. R. GRAY, PRINTER.  
1892.



# SPEECH

OF

## HON. JOSEPH H. WALKER,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

*Tuesday, March 15, 1892.*

---

The House being in Committee of the Whole and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6007) to place wool on the free list and reduce the duties on woolen goods—

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is to be regretted that in discussing this question, which is conceded by both sides to involve the interests of every man, woman, and child in the country, statistics and facts public to all and conceded to be correct by all can not be used on the one side and on the other. I have to say that you may search the speeches that are made in favor of protection from beginning to end and you will not find 1 per cent of error where you will find 99 per cent. of error in the statements that are made by those in favor of free trade as opposed to a protective tariff. In the speech that was made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], the free-trade leader of the House, the statements of what he called facts in support of his theory were substantially no facts from beginning to end.

I have to say, furthermore, that in the rebuttal that was made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], every statistician in the country will justify the statements made by him from beginning to end. I do not mean to say that when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] stated that he had found an item in the tariff on imports where the duty imposed was 323 per cent. the statement was not technically true, because there were some old shawls partly worn out that were reported as belonging to an immigrant who came in on the Northern frontier, and the law required that the duty should be imposed upon them at the value and weight they reported, and they weighed 2 pounds. From that simple circumstance the gentleman from Tennessee undertakes to mislead the country, deliberately and purposely, as to the rates of duty imposed by the McKinley bill on knit goods. He is put forward as the leader of the free traders of this House, and if they can take any comfort from that style of argument, from that sort of statement of great propositions, they are welcome to it.

Again, during the last Congress it was stated on this floor and at the other end of the Capitol that the duties imposed by the tariff upon horses was 600 per cent. The duty imposed is 20 per cent ad valorem and not less than \$30. How did they get that 600 per cent? They sent to Mexico and bought a broncho for \$5 and got cheated at that. They might just as well have said 1200 per cent for a \$2.50 broncho, which is about as much as those animals are worth. But if we were going to import a broncho worth \$5, then the tariff at \$30 a head (and 20 per cent if the horse cost over \$150) would make the 600 per cent. I do not mean to say, therefore, that these particular statements are not in a certain sense true. They are technically true; but the great body of the statements made upon that side in argument are not even technically true.

Having said this much, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the manufacturers of this country as such have not the slightest direct interest in a protective tariff.



It is of no consequence to the manufacturers of this country, as manufacturers, whether we have free trade or whether we have protection. We are just as well satisfied with free trade as we are with protection; and if the tariff is not in the interest of the farmer and the wage-worker and in their interest only, primarily and wholly, and only incidentally for the manufacturer, then I will vote with you to repeal the protective tariff, and we will adopt free trade at once if you choose to take the responsibility.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman mean to say that manufacturers would be equally as prosperous under a revenue tariff as under a protective tariff?

#### WELL BEING OF EVERY CITIZEN INVOLVED.

Mr. WALKER. I undertake to say that the manufacturers of this country as such—what would be left of them—would be more prosperous under free trade than under protection. That is precisely what I mean to say. But we are not legislating for manufacturers; we are legislating for farmers and wage-workers. No man on this floor has a right to cast a vote affirmatively on any bill that does not first of all benefit the man at the bottom. If that is not the effect of any bill, then we discredit ourselves in passing it. But the manufacturers are incidentally interested in a tariff. It has tremendous import to them, and involves with theirs the interest of every man, woman, and child in the land. The well-being of every citizen of this country is bound up with the interest of the manufacturers in a protective tariff.

Mr. DOCKERY. As I understand the gentleman, under his theory of protection the manufacturers are simply the disbursing agents of the bounty of the Government.

Mr. WALKER. I do not admit anything of the kind. [Laughter.] There is no "bounty of the Government" in it. That is a fiction of your own imagination; and you rest all your arguments upon fictions equally baseless.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] simply said it was his "understanding."

Mr. DOCKERY. I only desired to understand what the gentleman meant to say. That seemed to be the logic of his position.

Mr. WALKER. Now, it is conceded by every statistician of this country and every other that this is the lowest-taxed country on the face of the earth that is counted as a civilized nation. If your statement of our burdensome taxation is true, this could not be a fact; yet the statisticians who are counted as authority the world over make the declaration which I have repeated. But gentlemen say we are burdened with taxation; we are awfully taxed. I would like to ask gentlemen what a tax is? If taxation is not beneficent why do you have taxation? Why do you have taxation in your towns, in your counties, in your Democratic States? Why do you inveigh so bitterly against taxation on the floor of this House and yet in your own homes vote taxation?

#### TAXATION AN EVIDENCE OF CIVILIZATION.

I affirm that there is no greater evidence of civilization, Christian civilization than taxation, and the volume of taxation per capita expresses it. Show me the taxes per capita of any people, and I can determine by that their advancement in the scale of civilization. In Massachusetts we have taxation equal to \$14 per head, or \$70 a family. What does taxation come to in its last analysis? It comes to taking the property of the rich and dividing it pro rata for the benefit of every man, woman, and child in the community. That is what taxation comes to at last. What is taxation?

Mr. HARTER (speaking from the side of the Hall). I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WALKER. Please come up in front of me. I can not answer the questions of gentlemen both before and behind me. I will not be fired at all around the Hall. [Laughter.]

Now, what is taxation? Taxation is but the Government taking a part of the income of the citizen and spending it for the citizen to better advantage than he can himself spend it. That is all there is in taxation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

Mr. WALKER. Wait until I get through with this definition of taxation, and I will hear you.



I say that when the Government takes money by taxation and spends it economically for the citizen, not only can it spend the money to better advantage than the citizen, but it is impossible for the citizen to spend it for himself in such ways as the Government spends it. The Government, the great body of citizens represented in the Government, take a part of the income of the rich and spend it for all. Now, let me ask the gentlemen on this floor what proportion of the natural income of capital in the Northern States east of the Mississippi, those of older civilizations, what proportion of the income of such communities do you suppose is taken by taxation? More than one-third of the income from all the property east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio is taken in taxation, and beneficently taken—taken and returned to the citizens pro rata, rich and poor alike, after being taken out of the hoards of the rich.

Mr. HARTER. I am now before the gentleman. He said if I would come here in front of him he would answer a question. Is he ready [hesitating]?

Mr. WALKER. Well, be quick about it; I have but an hour, my dear fellow. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. I want to see whether I understood the gentleman—

Mr. WALKER. Go right on with your question.

Mr. HARTER. I understood the gentleman to say that no respectable statistician could affirm that any other country in the world is as lightly taxed as the United States. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. WALKER. That is what I understand.

Mr. HARTER. Now, I hold in my hand a dictionary of statistics prepared by—

Mr. WALKER. I can not yield for a dissertation or speech; just ask your question.

Mr. HARTER. Very well. This work, which is a standard authority, says that in the neighboring country of Canada—you can go to it in twelve hours from your home—the taxes are 25 or within a fraction of 25 per cent. less than the United States, and here is the authority for it.

Mr. WALKER. That will do; lay the book right down. [Laughter.] I will take your word for it.

Mr. HARTER. How do you explain that in view of your statement?

Mr. WALKER. Canada! Canada is brought here as an example. Canada! A country that has failed to collect taxes for its expenditures until it is burdened with debt to the point of being crushed beneath it.

Mr. HARTER. You can not say that we have ever failed here to collect our taxes.

Mr. WALKER. No; I say that we have collected our taxes and we have paid off our debts. But Canada! Why, the illustration the gentleman cites is simply a confirmation instead of a proof against the accuracy of my proposition. If Canada or any other country will pile up its debts day after day and year after year to be paid hereafter they may have once in a year or two a period of light taxation.

Mr. CARUTH. How much is the debt of Canada?

Mr. WALKER. I do not know—

A MEMBER. About \$300,000,000. About \$70 per capita, to our debt of \$14.50 per capita.

Mr. WALKER. But I have some other facts which I will give you which will probably answer your questions.

Mr. CARUTH. I would be glad to know.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF TAXES.

Mr. WALKER. It makes comparatively little difference where you lay your taxes. Lay them where you will, they will follow back and ultimately rest on the same persons and in the same spot. We may as well lay all the taxation of this Government on wool if we choose, as well as anywhere else. It will all rest on the same spot finally. It is of comparatively little importance where you lay taxes. It may take twenty years for them to adjust themselves to their final point. It may take thirty or forty years, but if you levy taxation anywhere it seeks out and rests upon the same individuals in the community who will ultimately bear the burdens. I think that the statistics will bear me out in this statement.



Now, Mr. Chairman, what are taxes? A man pays for the house he lives in directly, and he pays for the roads on which he travels through the State. It is no more fair, essentially, in the process of civilization, to count the roads a tax upon him than the building of the house in which the man lives. Taxation, instead of being a necessary evil, is no evil; it is not only necessary, but beneficent; it practically takes only that portion of the substance of the rich and powerful that can be more economically and wisely expended for the common good by the State, than it is possible for its possessors to expend for the same necessary purposes. As all men, without distinction, have an equal right to the use and enjoyment of the results of public expenditure, the collecting and the wise using of taxes is good, and not evil, and very largely in the nature of investments for the present and future generations. By it the civilization of a state may be measured.

The school that Christian civilization establishes, the clothing that the individual wears, the house in which he lives, and the money taken from the citizen for the education of his children is no more onerous as a tax than the money he pays for his clothes or food. So if it be a public building, if it is necessary for the common good to have it in the progress of civilization. So if it be a school, if it be the hat, the shoes, the clothing he wears, the police system of the country, the courts, the jails, the Army, the Navy, the judiciary. Not a dollar that is taken honestly and honestly spent—and I am talking now of an honest taxation and honest expenditures—that the citizen does not get back again in full measure in some shape.

#### GOVERNMENT AN AGENT.

The Government is simply the better medium than personal expenditure. The Government is the agent of the citizen in spending the money and spending it for his benefit. That is the result of taxation in a country like this, and yet where is the Democratic orator on this floor who has not denounced all taxation in the most extravagant and bitter terms? Why, you would think, Mr. Chairman, to hear these gentlemen talk, from the highest to the lowest, that the condition of the Comanche Indians and of the tribes of Central Africa, where they have no taxation, is a supreme blessing in comparison with the condition of the people of this country.

Now, I would like to ask, and I will give time to any gentleman on the Democratic side to answer this question, if there is a Democrat in this House who is in favor of the "principle of protection," whether any one of them would vote for its application as a general principle, or to any single article, or as it is understood in its application in the McKinley bill. Is there a Democrat here in favor of the protection principle in any form, in other words?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. No.

Mr. WALKER. Very well. The gentleman from West Virginia says not. You all agree to that; you all agree that there is not a Democrat in this House in favor of the principle of protection, do you? [Waiting for an answer.] Then you are in favor of the principle of free trade, are you not?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. As far as we can get to it with sufficient revenue for the needs of the Government.

Mr. WALKER. Then you favor free trade—the principle of free trade?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. As far as we can.

Mr. WALKER. Now, then, I ask the question again: Is there a man here on the Democratic side who does not stand with my friend from West Virginia in favor of the free-trade principle?

Mr. BUSHNELL. We are in favor of that kind of protection which leads eventually to free trade.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Just where General Garfield stood.

Mr. WALKER. Very well.

Now, I want to recur to the question of wages. I want to know if there is a man here who is ready to stand up and declare that wages are as high in Europe per day as they are here?

#### WAGES HIGHER HERE THAN ABROAD.

Is there a man in this House who is ready to dispute the proposition that is made by our own statisticians and the statisticians in Europe, that wages in this country are about half as high again, day by day and hour by hour, as they are in



England? Is there anyone here who is inclined to dispute that? Let him speak. [Waiting.] Then we all agree upon that.

Mr. HARTER. Do not you consider that begging the question on your part?

Mr. WALKER. I will come to that in half a minute. I think we are agreed upon that statement of fact.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You say we are all agreed upon that. If you mean to assert that we are agreed that wages in England are only half as high as in this country, and will buy no more than wages in this country, we do not agree at all.

Mr. WALKER. Now, I want to ask you what the economic distance is from here to Europe. What is the economic distance from Liverpool to Boston on a whole ship's cargo? That is to say, how far can you take a ship's cargo and carry it on the railroad, after you have landed it on the wharf in Boston, for the same money that is paid for bringing it across the ocean? You can not carry it 40 miles inland. Machinery of all kinds, set up, you can not carry 8 miles inland. Glass and glassware, 8 miles; chemicals, flax and hemp manufactured, India rubber goods, 50 miles; woolen, fancy goods, silk goods, etc., 100 miles; cotton, cutlery, leather, etc., 200 miles. You can not transport it, take it after the ship lands it at the wharf, and put it on a truck, take it to the Boston and Albany depot, for what the freight is after it is in the hold of the steamship in Liverpool. Now, if that is a fact, and I state it was a fact, two years ago—I have the freight rates per ton; I am not in any retail business now, but I am talking about the rate per ton—if that is a fact, then we are within 40 miles of Europe, so far as the railroad expense of transportation is concerned, as compared with ocean freights. Call it even 40 miles, and we are nearer Europe, economically, than Baltimore is to Washington.

Furthermore, I have to say this—and here is the question that my friend from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] says I am begging—I say, take 99 per cent. of the factories in Europe, in the woolen industries, the cotton industries, in the boot and shoe industry, in the leather industry, or in any other established industry where things are made for the millions, you may take 99 per cent. of the European factories and 99 per cent. of the American factories, and they will turn out just as much product, man for man, day for day, and hour for hour, as they will in this country.

Mr. HARTER. Where did you learn that?

Mr. WALKER. I learned it by personal inspection, in Europe.

Mr. HARTER. Your inspection has been limited, has it not?

Mr. WALKER. Not by any manner of means. I spent nine months' time in Europe in that investigation. I do not think my inspection was limited.

Mr. HARTER. Rather limited.

Mr. WALKER. Furthermore, I have consulted with the largest manufacturers on the floor of this House and in New England, Democrats and Republicans, and they agree with me in this.

Mr. HARTER. Have you consulted with Mr. Blaine? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. You may consult Mr. Blaine as much as you choose. I choose the men that I consult. [Laughter.] And furthermore, I always consult business men, not the politicians.

Mr. HARTER. You ought to consult me?

Mr. WALKER. I consult the experts in the business about which I wish to know. I notice that on the floor of this House lawyers know all about law—and everything else. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. We shall have to admit that.

Mr. SCOTT. Do you allude to parliamentary law? [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. How about the editors on the floor?

Mr. WALKER. I am old-fashioned enough to think that editors know more about running newspapers than I do; that shoemakers know more about running a shoe factory and what is necessary for them to do to meet competition; and cloth manufacturers know more about the manufacture of cloth; doctors know more of medicine, and lawyers know more of law. I never allow myself to do any law business without consulting a lawyer.

A MEMBER. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. And if I want to know about parliamentary law I consult a man who has studied parliamentary law, as a good many lawyers have not, even though he may be a manufacturer. Now, I have stated here, and there is no man can contradict it, except for political purposes or for purposes outside of economic



considerations, that the product, man for man, in the factories of Europe, as they are graded from highest to lowest, is as great in Europe as in this country, save that there are in Europe a few old factories, built hundreds of years ago, in obscure places, that are still run on odd things that are not subject to competition, that do not come into the calculation. But you may take 99 per cent. of the factories in Europe and all the factories here and grade them in classes as to efficiency and skill and ability in management, and man for man, hour by hour, they will produce as much in Europe as they produce here. Now, if you have agreed with me as far as I have gone—

A MEMBER. We have not.

Mr. WALKER. You have not successfully contradicted me, and you cannot.

You may make up some figures, as my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] made them up, and present them to this House, practically bogus, while technically true, that apparently contradict me. And you may deceive your constituents who are not familiar with manufacturing, just as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] did when he came up to educate us as to how we could run our factories to advantage in New England under free trade. He told us there were a great many things we did not know how to manufacture. [Laughter] He said we did not know how to manufacture knit goods and seamless stockings; that it was a secret process in Europe—

A MEMBER. And he convinced the country, did he not?

Mr. WALKER. When Shaw, up at Lowell, invented the machine, and all the machines in Europe were being run on a royalty paid to Shaw; and that is about as sound and about as accurate as the pretended facts and statements of the whole body of free-traders from beginning to end are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is only one gentleman in this House who is any authority on socks; and that subject you ought to leave to that gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. I beg the pardon of the House. For a moment it had escaped my mind that we had an expert on socks in the House. [Laughter.]

I propose to use many statistics, and my remarks will be exceedingly dry, as they doubtless have been thus far. For a hundred years we have been perfecting our system of protection.

I do not propose to give misleading percentages, such as where you have a factory in a village and you build there a blacksmith shop, and then say you have increased the manufactures 100 per cent., or where you have two and you build three more factories, you say you have increased the manufactures by 150 per cent., with no reference to their size. That is the kind of talk on which you free-traders build your arguments. I am talking to you of the conditions per capita or percentage per capita.

#### IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Under the free trade tariff of 1846 the imports in fifteen years, 1847 to 1861, average \$8.65 per capita, and are an average excess of imports over exports per capita of \$1.08 (leaving out the war and the inflation period of 1862 to 1879).

Under the protective tariff the imports in eleven years, 1880 to 1890, average \$12.11 per capita, an average excess of exports over imports per capita of \$1.38. The average for 1891 was \$13.36, an increase of 10 per cent in 1891 over the eleven-year period of 1880 to 1890, which will undoubtedly increase much more as the country adjusts itself to the new tariff.

Thus, during the whole fifteen years of free trade we averaged to lose \$1.08 per capita on our foreign trade. We gained \$1.38 per capita during each and every year of protection, under the normal conditions of 1880 and 1890, and are now gaining more than double that much under the McKinley bill.

If we were to shut up every factory we have in this country we would not export in five years as much as we export to-day. Talk about the markets of the world! What people have their economic wants more thoroughly satisfied than the people of this country and consume such a proportion of the products of their factories? This country consumes, according to all statisticians, three times as much per capita as and other country in the world, and if that be true, then we have a market that we are supplying equivalent to 180,000,000 of people as compared with England, France, or Germany. Furthermore, my friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS], and I will take his figures on this, as they suit my convenience, says that we produce here one-third of all the manufactures of the world.



If there are 1,434,000,000 of people in the world, 62,000,000 is 4.3 per cent of the population, and according to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] we consume seven and three-fourth times as much of manufactured products as the balance of the world averages to consume, which makes this the equivalent of a market of 480,500,000 of people of the world as they average. Our people have by our protective system this enormous market for what they produce, and yet the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] and the whole band of free traders are constantly vociferating "Take down the Bars, and open this market to Europe," in Congress and out of Congress, from Maine to Texas, from Massachusetts to the Mississippi River and beyond. Take down the bars! About as sensible a proceeding as it would be to "take down the bars" and let out our improved breeds of cattle with wild Texan steers, to be hooked and torn and mauled, and frozen to death by thousands, while "hunting their living." This is a country built up by means of a protective tariff. Such a country suits me, and its fiscal policy, which gives us such results, suits me. With such results conceded by all of you, do you want to try any other experiment?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. We want to see and to find out what goes with our share of that seven or ten times. We are not getting it ourselves.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for the observation. I want to tell him that you surely are getting it. There is no place on the face of the earth where the manufacturers make so small a percentage of profit as they do in this country, and where the farmer and wage-worker get so large a share of what they produce. I want to say to him and to the country, that I have examined the trade reports of the corporations in England and the trade reports of the corporations in America, which are open to us all. You can take the American Almanac, published by our Librarian, and trade journals open to everyone, and they give the dividends of the corporations all over the country. You can find out what they make, and that the profits in England as well as the average interest on the capital employed is more than in this country. For the last two years their profits have been small or *nil*. The reports of the British corporations show corporation after corporation in that time making no profit.

#### FREE TRADE BENEFITS THE RICH.

I have not calculated how much it is; it is an immense labor and would cost me two or three hundred dollars to make the calculation. But you will find about two-thirds of the English corporations, as you run down the list, paid no dividends last year. They paid more the year before, and the year before that they paid very good dividends up to the time their manufacturing was disturbed by the agitation of the tariff question here, and up to the time when there was a prospect of our manufacturing goods here that we had not manufactured before. In Great Britain the manufacturers are more wealthy than the manufacturers in this country. They are richer and have larger capital. Adopt free trade and allow their manufactured goods to come in here, and you will find every factory carried on by young, enterprising men who are in debt and have borrowed capital, and are in competition with the men from whom they learned their trade, and other men who have got rich, or old, or are rusted out, and thus cheapening products to the people—you will find that every one of this class will fail, and the rich men like Jesse Metcalf, Blaikie, and other manufacturers who are rich, or like my friend from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] here, or myself, will not only own their present factories but the plants of all the failed factories. If we can not double our fortunes within the next five years, beginning after free trade has starved American workmen down to European wages, then we must be exceeding stupid business men.

Mr. CRAIN. Why are you opposing it, then?

Mr. WALKER. I am opposing it in the common interest—for the common good. Can not you imagine that any man has any other interest than a mean and contemptible self interest? [Laughter.] Have you no idea that a man loves his country? Have you no conception that our sisters, our brothers, our fathers do and must work in our factories, and that our children after us must work in these factories, even if they are not working there now? I want to leave the glorious heritage of a glorious country to my children and my children's children.

Mr. CRAIN. Is that what you put up the money for, to pay the expenses of running a Republican campaign and electing a Republican President?

Mr. WALKER. That is precisely the reason. Why do the Democratic leaders



blackmail every rum hole in the country? Why do they have the purse of every importer in the country; and why do they have the Louisiana lottery which together furnish nine tenths of the money with which you run your campaigns? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRAIN. That statement is not true.

Mr. WALKER. I believe it to be true.

Mr. CRAIN. Let me ask you a question?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. You state that the percentage of the dividends on capital stock of our manufacturers was less than that of England. Is it not true that the manufacturers of this country pay out dividends in the shape of increase of stock, which they divide amongst their stockholders in lieu of actual cash dividends, and is the percentage you find in the almanac based upon cash capital stock; money invested in the stock or the additional stock capital which is paid to stockholders in lieu of cash?

Mr. WALKER. I have two things to say with reference to that; first, that what ever is true in respect to that in this country is also true in England and other countries; secondly, that for one case where you will find that state of things existing, you will find other cases where the mills have been unsuccessful and the stock has been scaled down. And I will say further with reference to our New England factories—I do not know so much about others—that the amount of the scaling down of the capital of factories will equal or exceed the stock dividends that have been paid.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Well, but is it a fair showing that they make in these statistics?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly it is.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Is it a fair statement of the percentage upon the cash invested?

Mr. WALKER. Undoubtedly. If the scaling down equals the watering, it is a fair percentage of the whole.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. WALKER. Let me get through with this, and then I will listen to your question.

#### EFFECTS OF M'KINLEY TARIFF.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to show, and can show, that not one word that you gentlemen say about the ill effects of the McKinley tariff is true, not a word from beginning to end. [Laughter.]

The last year before our foreign trade was influenced by tariff legislation, 1889, the imports and exports were \$1,488,000,000.

The McKinley bill has only been in full operation for the six months ending December 31, 1891. The imports and exports for the six months ending December 31, 1891, \$947,000,000, indicating a foreign trade in the year 1892 of \$1,894,000,000, an increase of the foreign trade under the McKinley bill over that of 1889 of \$406,000,000, or 27 per cent.

The exports in the six months ending December 31, 1891, were \$551,000,000; the imports in the six months ending December 31, 1891, were \$396,000,000; the exports exceeded the imports by \$155,000,000, the difference being settled by the return of our securities from Europe.

The goods that came in free of duty in the six months ending December 31, 1891, were 53.8 per cent.; the goods that came in free of duty in 1889, were 34.6 per cent.; the increased percentage of goods that came in free of all duty under the McKinley tariff over the tariff it supplanted are 55.5 per cent.; more than half as many again of goods coming in, absolutely free of all duties, under the McKinley bill as under the old tariff.

The duties collected in 1889 were \$229,000,000; the duties collected the six months ending December 31, 1891, were \$83,000,000; making a rate for 1892 of \$166,000,000. The annual reduction of tariff receipts under the McKinley bill will probably be \$63,000,000, while the receipts from internal revenue will be increased

#### RATE OF DUTY.

We have seen that the goods coming in free of duty under the McKinley bill, are more than half as much again in value than under the old tariff.



The rate of duty on all dutiable goods imported into England under "free trade" is 72.6 per cent., and the duties collected amount to \$2.79 per capita.

In the six months ending December 31, 1891, the duty collected on dutiable goods was 46.6 per cent.; the same in 1889 was 45.13 per cent.; the same in 1888 was 45.63 per cent.; the same in 1887 was 47.10 per cent.; the average for those years 47.14 per cent., an increase of only fifty-four one-hundredths of 1 per cent. under the McKinley tariff, while allowing more than half as many again goods to come in free of duty.

The average duty collected on both dutiable and free in 1889 under old tariff was 29.5 per cent.; the same in six months ending December 31, 1891, under the McKinley tariff was 21.5 per cent.; a reduction on total imports of 8 per cent. That is to say, the average duty covering all imports was over 37 per cent. more under the old tariff than under the six months of the McKinley tariff ending December 31, 1891, or three-eighths more.

This is not all. The duties collected under the old tariff in 1889 averaged for every man, woman, and child \$3.60. In the six months named, under the McKinley tariff, it was only \$1.33 per capita, or at the annual rate of \$2.66; showing a reduction of a trifle about \$1 per capita duties collected, and also showing the duties collected on imported goods per capita in England to be over 6 per cent. more than those collected in this country under the McKinley tariff, and showing the per capita duties collected under the old tariff to be over 37 per cent. more than the duties imposed by the McKinley tariff.

Mr. WATSON. Mention the dutiable goods under the English tariff.

Mr. WALKER. In speaking of dutiable goods, the rates I have stated are those on dutiable goods.

Mr. WATSON. But is not 95 per cent. of that amount raised in England from the duties upon pure luxuries, tea, coffee, spirits, tobacco, and fruits?

Mr. WALKER. The taxation per family upon tea and coffee alone in England, which are now recognized as within the line of economic wants, is \$2.42 per family—if that is what you want, to tax tea and coffee, I would like you to admit it. I will ask the gentleman a question. Does he want to put a tax on tea and coffee? Are you in favor of that? [After a pause] Well, I would have the courage to say yes or no. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. I was asking you a question. I was asking you if 95 per cent. of the English revenues raised by way of duties was not raised from five articles, articles of luxury.

#### COST OF NECESSARIES.

Mr. WALKER. Tea and coffee are not luxuries. As I was saying, the rate there is \$2.79 per capita. In this country, as well as in England, the most of our tariff revenue is raised on things that are only bought by the rich. You can not show a solitary thing that a laboring man, with five in a family, earning \$2 a day, buys in this country, as a necessity for his family, for which he pays more than he would have to pay in England, except woolen goods. The official figures show that tax can not be \$1 per capita, and one-half the aggregate is paid by the rich and 90 per cent. of the other half by persons north of Mason and Dixon's line. Furthermore, I say to you that the total things a laboring man, earning \$2 a day, has to buy as necessities for his family of five, he can buy cheaper here than in Europe.

Mr. WATSON. I thought it only fair to you and your argument that in stating the amount of the percentage of tariff taxation in England upon imported goods you should state, in order to make your own argument symmetrical, that about 90 or 95 per cent. of that tax was raised from articles of luxury, tea, coffee, spirits, fruit, and tobacco.

Mr. WALKER. I understand that, everybody knows that. I object to your using any more of my time. You have not answered my question about taxing tea and coffee.

Mr. WATSON. I was answering your question.

Mr. WALKER. If you are going to answer my question, please answer it quickly.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I will answer it quickly. I am a free trader from the ground up.

Mr. WALKER. All right; that is, you are like all the Democrats in the House—

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The Republican tariff made the workingman so



poor that he could not buy coffee, and then the Republican party takes the tax off coffee so that rich people pay no taxes upon it.

Mr. WALKER. For a statement of that kind thrust into my speech, I am very much obliged, for there is not a single man in my part of the country so ignorant that he will not see through it.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question for information?

Mr. WALKER. Be brief. My time is nearly gone.

Mr. BUTLER. I will be very brief. The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that the average tariff rate in England was 70 odd per cent and in this country 40 odd. Is that the reason why the manufacturer in England makes a larger per cent of profit than the American manufacturer?

Mr. WALKER. Your question was not sincere; you are not asking that question for information—not by any manner of means.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I suppose not; because if so I would have asked it of some one who could give me information.

#### LABOR STATISTICS.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. I ask a moment of the gentleman to correct a statement which I know he will be glad to correct. He stated that the workman of England did as much work as the workman of America. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the report on labor statistics made by Mr. Evarts as Secretary of State May 7, 1879, in which report he says that "One workman in the United States, as will be seen from the foregoing extracts, does as much work as two workmen in most of the countries of Europe."

Mr. WALKER. O, well, that is true, taking all countries; but that is all nonsense, as everybody knows, when applied to our competitors, England, France, Belgium, Germany, etc.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Does Mr. Evarts talk nonsense?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, as you represent him. What does he know about manufactures [laughter], except to publish what is reported to him?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Evarts, in his report—

Mr. WALKER. Well, I have the floor, I think, and I must continue.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit an interruption?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman, but in his opening remarks he did me an injustice; and, in order that the correction may go along with his statement, I will read his language as taken down, so as to see whether he is correctly reported.

Mr. WALKER. I stated that in what the gentleman said he quoted from the official returns, and so far his statement was entirely correct. I said so in the remarks that I made.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to know whether the gentleman said what I am about to read. If he did, I think he will make amend very readily after my statement.

From that simple circumstance he undertakes—

Referring to me—

to mislead deliberately and purposely the country as to the rates of duty imposed by the McKinley bill on knit goods.

Mr. WALKER. I will amend that by adding the words, "it has the appearance of seeming to mislead." [Laughter.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, I want to correct the gentleman's statement, in view of the fact that he does not seem to wish to be entirely candid in this matter. I do not make statements at random on this floor.

Mr. WALKER. I said you did not.

Mr. McMILLIN. I state by the record that if the gentleman understood what he was talking about, he deliberately misled the House. He said—here is his statement of this matter—

Mr. WALKER. But I must have my hour.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, you will have plenty of time.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman's time shall not be curtailed. He says that that was the import rate on "one old shawl." Is the gentleman correctly reported in that?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir; I presume so.



## "KNIT FABRICS."

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, that is not true; and in order to show the gentleman that he is in error, and that I spoke whereof I knew, I read from the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in regard to imported merchandise entered for consumption in the United States in 1891. I read from page 150; and here let me say that the item to which I had reference when I spoke some time ago is found on page 150, under the head of "knit fabrics," upon which the rate of duty under the bill was 33 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem. The total amount imported in 1891 under that head was 1.9 pounds. The value was \$15; the rate of duty was 40 per cent ad valorem, plus 33 cents per pound. The duty collected on that \$15 worth of goods so imported was \$48.75, or 323 per cent.

Now, sir; all I want to say is that if the gentleman is correct, and it was as he stated but "one old shawl" that was imported, it was the heaviest shawl that was ever imported. I leave the House to determine whether I was correct in my statement or whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is accurate in his contradiction.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not state the rate under the McKinley tariff, in his original speech. Since the gentleman from Tennessee made his statement the Department has investigated that item and it turns out to have been a bundle of old shawls and fabrics of that character that came over with a family that crossed the line at Manitoba.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then your statement that it was "one old shawl" was incorrect and you had that knowledge in your possession when you made the statement?

Mr. WALKER. It makes no material difference on the question of whether the McKinley tariff bill should be repealed or not, whether the matter over which we are debating here was "one old shawl" or two or three old shawls, or a lot of old stockings and shawls combined, and breeches and Cardigan jackets that belonged to a Canadian family and brought across the line at Manitoba and valued by them—not by the Department, remember, but by themselves—at \$15. If the gentleman from Tennessee bases his argument on that item then he is welcome to the effect of it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does not the gentleman know that the McKinley law allows wearing apparel to be brought in free of duty?

Mr. WALKER. I do.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then how does it happen that this high duty was levied on this old lot of wearing apparel that you speak of?

Mr. WALKER. If this shipment had been claimed as wearing apparel for the family having it, it would not have paid duty; but the family who brought it did not claim it as such; they said it belonged to another family, to people who were not with them.

## PROTECTION BENEFITS THE FARMERS.

Now, as to the farmer, Mr. Chairman: There is no man in this country who has reaped a tithe of the benefits of the protective system in this country that the farmer has reaped and is reaping to-day. There is not a single agricultural machine or implement anywhere in the world, except the old-fashioned plows and hoes and spades that were in use prior to 1860, that was not invented or first brought into use here, except perhaps the steam plow and a few very heavy tools. Our agricultural implements are so far ahead of those of other countries that our farmers have been able to take the markets of England and get a large price for our grain there, even over the cheap labor of India, Russia, and other parts of Europe, notwithstanding their cheap labor, because of our improved machinery given us by the genius and skill of American mechanics, who exist because of the protective tariff, and they have given our farmers the advantages which our improvements in agricultural methods gave to our people and to the world.

But, sir, this condition of things in controlling English markets cannot be continued. Why? Because this improved machinery is being taken into these older countries and our own farmers are being beaten out of the English market with the cheap labor of foreign countries and by our own machinery. The remedy our farmers must find, if anywhere, is to reduce their number by 5 per cent., and find employment in manufacturing the things they now buy in Europe, and then they can get the same advantage from the protective tariff, in years to come, that it has given them in the past.



Ah, but my friend from Tennessee will appear on the floor to-morrow and tell me that the McCormick reaper was invented in France. So the principle of it was, and would have stayed there dead in the shop of its inventor if it had not been brought here and developed by the McCormicks. I do not say that the idea first conceived was not first brought to this country from abroad in some kinds of machinery; but every piece of it has been improved, made practical and of utility by the skill and inventive genius of the American mechanic. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there was not a piece of boot and shoe machinery in Europe of any kind or description twenty-five years ago, not a piece.

#### KNOWLES' LOOMS IN ENGLAND.

Again, the very looms upon which the finest fancy wool goods are being woven in Europe (excepting a small per cent. of them—I am not positive of the per cent.) are American looms or duplicates of American looms, or are made on principles first applied here. I hold in my hand a trade journal published in London, February 15, 1890, the Textile Record, in which I see it stated—the journal is not pagged—in the advertisement of Hutchinson, Hollingsworth & Co., that they have manufactured 8,870 looms under the patents of Mr. Knowles of my own town. There is scarcely any great improvement that has cheapened products, with the exception of iron and steel products—and in regard to iron and steel England has always led us in invention and manufacture until recently—that was not originated by American workmen. There is scarcely a solitary thing, excepting in iron and steel, for which they are not indebted to this country.

Let me read you a list of some American inventions: The cotton gin; the planing machine, invented in my town by a man named Daniels. Then the Woodworth machine, I think, was invented in Albany, but it is not suitable for a great many purposes that the Daniels machine is used for; the Blanchard lathe, that completely revolutionized the making of all irregular forms, and brought them down to a cost of not over 2 to 5 per cent. of what they were before it was invented; all agricultural machinery, all leather machinery, all our boot and shoe machinery, sewing machines. Revolving firearms were invented in Paris. There is an old patent that existed before we made them here, but by more recent patents they were covered so that we had the control of them, and introduced them to the world from the city in which I live; also, the rotary printing press, made by Hoe. Here let me stop to say that, spending six weeks with Mr. Hoe in Rome in 1876, when I got back to London I found Mr. Hoe there. I said, "Mr. Hoe, are you staying here in Europe as long as this? Who runs your business in New York?" "Oh," he said, "my brother." It was Richard with whom I was acquainted. But he said, "I live here in London most of the time."

"What are you doing in London?" I asked.

He replied, "I am making my printing presses here."

I said, "Can you afford to do that? Is material so much cheaper in London that you can afford to be at the great expense of running two shops?"

He said, "Why, the iron and steel that go into a press that I get \$25,000 or \$30,000 for do not cost me anything to speak of. We do not count the material in estimating the cost of a machine. We never figure it, it is so small." But, he said, "skilled mechanics I can hire here for a quarter what I can hire them for in New York, and I can build these printing presses in London for a little more than one-quarter what I can build them for in New York."

So they are doing in Europe with all our machinery. You can not adopt a new system, you can not invent a new machine, you can not adopt a new method in your factories, without the knowledge of it being sent to Europe by the first mail. Artificial ice, bolt machines, the telegraph, the telephone, typewriters, high explosives, pin machines, torpedoes, electric railroads, smokeless powder, Bigelow carpets, the Compton loom and the Knowles loom, are all American inventions. So it runs to the end of the chapter.

Now, let me say to this House that before the Vienna Exposition, which I think was in 1872 or 1873, Europe was so far behind us that we could compete with her on nearly anything and everything, providing she would let our machinery alone, and we could undersell her in many of "the markets of the world;" but when we exhibited our machinery there, from that moment they began to send agents to this country to watch every industry, to take over our inventions as rapidly as we make them. I will publish in my speech the penal protection laws of England.



No country ever went to such extremes in protecting her manufacturing and industrial interests by tariffs, bounties, and penalties as England, until she had so built up her manufacturing as to be able to defy the world, as we could do now had we as low wages as she. Every colony of Great Britain has found it impossible to develop a home market by diverting her people into manufacturing to supply their own wants, without a protective tariff. Every one of her colonies now has a heavy protective tariff. Read carefully the former penal protective laws of England, under which she fully reached her present position, and then know how mean and selfish is her railing at us, and remember, while reading, that material or moral or intellectual progress is impossible to any people excepting through mechanical and industrial development.

PENAL PROTECTION IN ENGLAND UP TO 1824.

5 George I, chapter 27, A. D. 1718: repealed 5 George IV, chapter 97, A. D. 1824.

"An act to prevent the inconveniences arising from seducing artificers in the manufactures of Great Britain into foreign parts.

"Whereas divers ill-disposed persons, as well foreigners as subjects of this Kingdom, by confederacy with foreigners have late drawn away and transported and have also made divers attempts to entice, draw away, and transport several artificers and manufacturers of and in wool, iron, steel, brass, and other metals, clock-makers, watchmakers, and divers other manufacturers of Great Britain, out of His Majesty's dominions into foreign countries by entering into contracts with them to give them greater wages and advantages than they have or can reasonably expect within this Kingdom, and by making them large promises and using other arts to inveigle and draw them away; and whereas there is great danger that by means of these and such like practices, many great and profitable branches of the trades and manufactures of this Kingdom may be transported into foreign countries: Therefore, for preventing like practices for the future, be it enacted," etc. (Synopsis of the act or parts of it.)

That persons convicted of contracting with or enticing, etc., any artificer in wool, iron, steel, brass, or any other metal, clockmaker, watchmaker, or any other artificer or manufacturer of Great Britain, to go into a foreign country shall be fined not exceeding £100 for the first offense and be imprisoned for three months: but for the second offense shall be fined discretely and imprisoned for twelve months. \* \* \* After May 1, 1719, any artificer going into a foreign country, there to exercise his trade, and not returning in six months after warning given him by the ambassador, etc., shall be incapable of taking any legacy, etc., forfeit all his lands, goods, and chattels, and be deemed an alien. (Severe methods for the enforcement of this act are provided.)

23 George II, chapter 13, A. D. 1750; partly repealed 5 George IV, chapter 97, 1824; repealed stat. law rev. act, A. D. 1867.

"An act for the effectual punishing of persons convicted of seducing artificers in the manufactures of Great Britain \* \* \* out of the dominion of the Crown of Great Britain, and to prevent the exportations of utensils made use of in woollen and silk manufactures from Great Britain and Ireland into foreign parts," etc. \* \* \* And whereas notwithstanding the penalties to which offenders against the said act (5 George I, chapter 27) are thereby subjected, divers wicked and evil-disposed persons have of late seduced into foreign several artificers in the woollen and other manufactures, and it is therefore become necessary to make some further and more effectual provision to deter such persons," etc.: therefore be it enacted, etc.

(Synopsis of parts of the act.)

That persons convicted of seducing artificers in the manufactures of Great Britain and Ireland out of the Dominion of Great Britain to forfeit £500 and to be imprisoned for twelve months, and for a second offense to forfeit £1000 and be imprisoned for two years. Persons exporting utensils of the woollen and silk manufactures shall forfeit such utensils and £200. Officers of the customs empowered to seize such utensils found on board ships bound to foreign parts. Captains of vessels permitting such utensils to be put on board to forfeit £100, and if he is captain of one of His Majesty's ships he shall lose his employment and never hold office again. So an officer of customs, if he signs an instrument allowing such tools, etc., to go out, shall forfeit £100 and lose his employment.

(This act was repealed, as to the seducing of artificers to go into foreign parts, by 5 George IV, chapter 97, 1824, but was in force as to exportation of tools, etc., till repealed, 1867, by the statute law revision act. Of course it had become practically inoperative before that date.)

14 George III, chapter 71, A. D. 1774; repealed 6 George IV, chapter 105, 1825.

"An act to prevent the exportation to foreign parts of utensils made use of in the cotton, linen woollen, and silk manufactures of this kingdom."

Whereas the exportation of several tools, etc., made use of in the manufactures of cotton, linen, or other goods wherein cotton and linen are used, will enable foreigners to make up such manufactures and thereby greatly diminish the exportation of the same, etc.:

Be it enacted. \* \* \* That after July 1, 1774, any person shipping tools or utensils used in cotton or linen manufactures in order to export the same, shall forfeit such tools and £200. (The provisions of this act are much like that of 23 George III, chapter 13.) Further, any person collecting such tools or implements in order to export the same, on complaint of witnesses, justices may grant warrants to seize them and the person \* \* \* and try him, etc.

(This act was repealed as to hand wool cards only by 15 George III, chapter 5, in 1775.)

1 George III, chapter 37, A. D. 1781; repealed 6 George IV, chapter 105, 1825.

This act simply makes the penalties of the last act—14 George III, chapter 71—still more stringent. No goods or utensils, models, machines used in cotton, woollen, linen, or silk manufactures are to be put on board any ship. Penalties on captain and customs officers made more severe, and informers are to get a share of goods forfeited.

22 George III, chapter 60, A. D. 1782; repealed in part 5 George IV, chapter 97, 1824, repealed residue 6 George IV, chapter 105, 1825.



"An act to prevent the seducing of artificers or workmen employed in printing calicoes, cotton, muslins, or linens, or in making or preparing blocks, plates, or other implements used in that manufactory, to go to parts beyond the seas and to prohibit the exporting to foreign parts any such blocks, plates or other implements."

(The provisions of this act are much like the preceding.)

For every artificer so induced the offender shall pay £1,000 and be imprisoned for two years without bail.

Informers are given half the forfeited goods.

25 George III, chapter 67, A. D. 1785; repealed 6 George IV, chapter 105, 1825.

"An act to prohibit the exportation to foreign parts of tools and utensils made use of in the iron and steel manufactures of this kingdom and to prevent the seducing of artificers or workmen employed in those manufactures to go into parts beyond the seas."

(Much like the previous statutes.)

First offense for seducing artificers, etc., to be £500 and twelve months imprisonment in common goal without bail. Second offense £1,000 and two years without bail.

26 George III, chapter 89, A. D. 1786; repealed 6 George IV, chapter 105, A. D. 1825.

This act amends simply and makes more explicit act 25 George III, chapter 67, and specifies certain other things which are to come within the operation of said act.

27 George III, chapter 36, A. D. 1787; repealed stat. law rev. act 1871.

Simply an act to continue 26 George III, chapter 89.

This statute had become obsolete long before 1871.

28 George III, chapter 23, A. D. 1788; repealed stat. law rev. act A. D. 1871.

Also an act to continue 26 George III, chapter 89.

(This also was obsolete before 1871.)

29 George III, chapter 35, A. D. 1789; repealed stat. law rev. act A. D. 1871.

Also an act to continue 26 George III, chapter 89.

(This also was obsolete before 1871.)

All three of the above related each to different articles mentioned in 26 George III, chapter 89.

30 George III, chapter 18, A. D. 1790; repealed as above, 1871.

Same in substance as the three preceding statutes.

31 George III, chapter 43, A. D. 1791; repealed stat. law rev. act, 1861.

Same as four preceding statutes.

32 George III, chapter 36, A. D. 1792; repealed as above, 1871.

Same as five preceding statutes.

33 George III, chapter 40, A. D. 1783; repealed as above, 1871.

Same as above.

34 George III, chapter 33, A. D. 1795; repealed as above, 1861.

This act makes perpetual act, 26 George III, chapter 89.

(So the above acts were mostly repealed in 1824 and 1825, and the parts which escaped repeal at that time were repealed in the great revision acts of 1861-'67 and 1871.)

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. If you believe in the home market so strongly, what did you exhibit your goods in Vienna for?

Mr. WALKER. We exhibited them just as Americans always exhibit everything, for good neighborhood, the general good. Our generosity is quite opposite to that of the English. When I went to Europe I had letters from the American Commissioner of the Vienna Exposition, and from citizens of this country of the highest character, but not an English factory would open its doors to me anywhere. Yet when these very men came to this country, to our factory in Chicago, my partner took them all over the factories and showed them everything, as I did in Worcester, and as all American manufacturers do, with very few exceptions. That is the rule here, to live and let live; and if we can not compete on equal terms, we will go down.

Mr. CLOVER. You will put on a tariff. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Why do you want protection if you want to compete with them on equal terms?

#### COMPETITION ON EQUAL TERMS.

Mr. WALKER. Equal terms in equal conditions. We put on a tariff because we have to pay our laborers one-half more, and that is the only reason.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. And you get twice as much work out of them?

Mr. WALKER. That is entirely false, every word of it. I propose to use just that word. No man who does not know that to be untrue has any moral right to appear in a discussion of tariff laws.



Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Then, Mr. Blaine told what was not true when he made that statement?

Mr. WALKER. I do not care anything about Mr. James G. Blaine. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The statement of Mr. James G. Blaine or any other man does not make a thing true or false.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. But he made the statement?

Mr. WALKER. I do not believe he said it.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Well, it was published all over the world.

Mr. WALKER. I do not care if it was.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. It was published officially, by the Republican Administration, and it was based upon the reports of our consuls that were made to him from the factories of England and of Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany, and other foreign countries. What have you got to say about the official statements of your own Administration? I suppose there is nothing in the world you believe that is not said by yourself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PENDLETON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to finish his remarks.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended. He is helping us every time he opens his mouth. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Massachusetts have further time? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is just as well assured as any fact can be assured, that the operatives in the factories in Europe produce as much hour by hour and man for man as they produce in this country. The operatives come from the factories there into our factories from time to time and from year to year, and generally we hire them in preference, because we find them more skilled, and they will produce more per hour than our American workmen.

Furthermore, they have been born and bred to spin and weave from generation to generation. They have the advantage which you all know comes from heredity, and that is one reason why we can not make the high class of the finer woolen goods in this country, added to the fact that the demand for such goods is so limited that they can not be produced in sufficiently large quantities to be economically made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Right at that point I desire to ask the gentleman a question for information. Is it not true that all the protection the laborer gets on the class of goods he makes, when it comes to the consumer he has to pay the cost of that protection? Admitting that a certain class of laborers are benefited by protection, for argument's sake, when the consumer of the South comes to consume the article from your shop does he not pay the amount that has been given the laborer in that protection to the factory?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask you to answer the question.

Mr. WALKER. I will answer you; but the rule requires me to say "Mr. Chairman." [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the gentleman that the world is full of paradoxes; that the system of doing business in this country is such that it is not true that the article costs the consumer as much more as the difference of wages; that what we make—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am afraid the gentleman did not catch the point.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I did catch the point. Your point is not so peculiarly sharp but what I could catch it. [Laughter.]

Let me say that the price to the consumer in this country, by our system of doing business, is as low as the prices are to the consumer—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is not the question.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir; it is exactly the answer to your question, and I will tell you why and how. In Europe you go to buy any number of things, and each thing you want to buy is in a little shop devoted to that one thing. And those who are running that shop must maintain themselves and get their living from it.

Everything is divided infinitesimally. You have to go to forty shops to buy what you can buy in one store here. Furthermore, they get and must get a larger



profit on such things, where they are disposed of in that way in serving the community; while here we have immense shops where everything is kept, and you go into a store and you buy everything, sold to you by a boy or woman, and it does not cost as much by 10 per cent. in the time that it requires you to go around and buy the things as in Europe, and the store expenses on sales are that much less.

Furthermore, our sales are in immense quantities. Where you run a factory and produce a certain quantity of goods, goods that will pay the cost of production and make 5 per cent. profit, if you can double the quantity you can sell them for 5 per cent. less and make them for 5 per cent. less because of the increased quantity you make—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me state the question again, and I would like to have an answer. I do not hinge so much upon the sharpness of my point as I do upon the bluntness of your perception to see the point of the question.

Mr. WALKER. I will confess to any degree of bluntness in comprehending or answering anything if I can only be the means of protecting the workingman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the Georgia farmers can buy the articles they must consume cheaper abroad than here under this protective system, is not that costing them just so much more, and is it not class legislation? That is the question; and I would like to have the gentleman answer it.

#### TAXATION IS UNSELFISHNESS.

Mr. WALKER. You may take any man, anywhere, in any community, and isolate his temporary monetary interest from all its members, and what advantage is it for him to have a schoolhouse or schools if he has no children to send to school? What advantage is it for him to have churches if he does not attend them? And why should a man who does not keep a horse pay taxes to make roads; what use has he for roads in that community? Why should you tax him for roads? What is the use of any man paying any tax for the benefit of the rest of the community? Why not allow each man to consult his immediate personal interest alone in that community?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We do not object to righteous taxation.

Mr. WALKER. That is exactly what you do object to. As I have stated before, and fully stated it, the market for your agricultural products is increased three times over by the wages that are paid in this country, ay, ten times.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do not you force me to sell my cotton in a free market and then force me to buy my cotton goods in a protected market? Is that right?

Mr. WALKER. I say unqualifiedly, yes, it is right; because of the advantages you get in ten thousand indirect as well as direct ways which far more than make up for the extra prices you have to pay, even if you had to pay any extra prices, which you do not. Every price-list proves that taking the prices that you have to pay for everything that you consume on your farm for yourself and your family and your help, excepting a few of the finest woolen clothes; take the whole list straight through, and go over to Liverpool or to Yorkshire, and you will find that you can not buy those goods at the retail shops any cheaper, as a whole, there than you can buy them in your own towns.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What is the use of the tariff, then?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. What do you want protection for?

Mr. WALKER. I will tell you if you will give me time.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. You can have all the time you want.

#### ▲ PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATION.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I will illustrate it. I can not state it so well any other way as by an illustration, because I propose to deal in facts, not in sky-scraping theories after the manner of free-traders. I will give you facts. [Laughter.] A little spectacle factory was started several years ago at Southbridge, in my district. When they commenced, the spectacles they produced sold in the market at \$6.75 a dozen, and the man continued the business three or four years before he made anything, before he even did as well as he had done earning day wages before he started that business. But he went to work and made machinery for grinding the glasses, for making the frames, for making the screws that go into the frames, for drilling the holes in the glasses, and scores of other things, and the result was that he reduced the cost of those spectacles so that after a time he was selling them at



\$1.75 a dozen, the same identical class and grade of spectacles that he had sold at first at \$6.75 a dozen, only they were better finished.

There were men who learned the trade in his factory and who went out to Detroit and started a spectacle factory there. They undertook to put spectacles on this market, but they found that he had the market, and his spectacles were so good and the difference between their prices and his was so slight that they lost money for a few years; I do not remember the time exactly, but I think it was about five years that they struggled on in Detroit. Then they took up that factory bodily, every piece of machinery, everything but the floors and the bricks and mortar, and took it across the water to Bohemia and went to work there making spectacles and sending them in here, and owing to the cheapness of labor they were able to send them in at a low a price that they would have driven our own manufacturers out of the market if we had not kept them out by the McKinley bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is just what I object to. I want to buy my spectacles as cheap as I can.

Mr. WALKER. You do?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes, sir. What you have described is just what I object to.

Mr. WALKER. Then I want to say God deliver me from your morality and disposition! [Laughter.] I want to buy my spectacles of my brother who is a spectacle-maker, my shoes of my brother who is a shoemaker, my cloth of my brother who is a weaver, and pay them fair wages while they make them. If you want to buy yours in Europe where they are made at Bohemian prices and in barbarism or by the sweating system, I am not with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I thought you said they were just as cheap here as they are there.

Mr. WALKER. Just as cheap?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. They would be cheaper here if those people did not rob us of our tools and machinery and starve their workmen while making them.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Who robbed you?

Mr. WALKER. Take another illustration which has been presented 10,000 times, but still it is a good one, and worth repeating. Take wire nails; we put on a tariff of 4 cents a pound. That was when they were selling at 8 cents a pound, and we kept on that tax until they were selling here at 2½ cents a pound. Again, take steel rails, we put a tax of \$28 a ton on them when they were selling at \$78 a ton, and we kept on that tax until they sold here at \$28 a ton, a less price than they cost in England.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Do you regard protection as the only cause of that reduction?

Mr. WALKER. Yes! The only means that enabled us to compete in making them.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. The inventive genius of the American people counts for nothing in producing that result?

Mr. WALKER. Protection kept the inventor alive while exercising his genius. It is the main cause. How can a man live if he can not eat and drink? Throw a man who can not swim into water twenty feet deep, what comfort is it to him to tell him not to mind, that it will all run off in fifteen or twenty minutes; what satisfaction is that to him [laughter], if he is dead in the mean time?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. But after he learns to swim it is all right.

Mr. WALKER. But you will not allow him to learn. You increase his difficulties in low wages, so it is of no use to him. What you ask is that the moment our men invent anything, and thereby cheapen the product, they shall immediately go out of the business or take starvation wages.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Because like yourself they are patriotic. As soon as a manufacturing enterprise reaches a point where it can successfully compete with the foreign manufacture then the tariff should be taken off or at least reduced.

Mr. WALKER. What hurt does the tariff do when you can buy the thing resulting from it cheaper at home than abroad?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Simply because we are here representing not particular classes, not manufacturers, not farmers, but the body of the people, the consumers, including all classes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I take it for granted that the coat the gentleman has on—



## THE SOUTH RUINED BY DEMOCRACY.

Mr. WALKER. Let me say for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] that the South has refused to use protection, and insulted and abused the North for using it, from the days of Calhoun. Before his day we were a united people on the question of protection. The protective tariff is not an end sought, but the means to an end. It is a barrier for defense to men while seeking a higher development and a higher civilization when it is obtained. If the people of the Southern States will not avail themselves of the advantages a protective tariff affords them to employ and develop its people to a higher civilization, it is a deliberate and willful refusal by that people of all its advantages, and they have no right to seek to pull down the Northern workingman to the level of their workingmen in the South. Economically, the people of a State are one and indivisible, and are socially, in intelligence and morality, on that plane which the whole people taken together average, and must be measured on it.

While the North has for a hundred years been making use of every advantage it could secure from a protective tariff, the South, until recently, and even now, is refusing them. She has ruined herself with Democracy, and is trying to defeat the development of Northern civilization, instead of using her natural advantages in developing her own agricultural, material, mechanical, and manufacturing wealth, like the dog in the manger, and I am sorry truth compels me to say a very mean dog at that. She is now justly reaping the fruit of what she has sown. So long as her farmers continue to raise only one crop, and do not try to use the advantage of a multiplicity of crops as do Northern farmers, she does not deserve and will not receive the advantages of a protective tariff and modern civilization.

It gave her farmers no advantage who refused to use it in the days of slavery, and just so long and in just the proportion that she sits and mourns for past opportunities, instead of using present ones, she will continue to be, as compared with the North, in a lower civilization and in barbarous condition. There is no part of the country in which the farmers and all the people are offered the large opportunity for rapid increase of wealth and improvement of their social condition as at the South, but so long and in just the proportion that she treats the North as a foreign country it will be a foreign country to her. It is the law of compensation. So long as she remains sour, proud, envious, revengeful, thriftless, and slights, insults, and abuses, and many times destroys the property of men her betters, who would go into and develop her country, she must lag behind in civilization.

I think I will not go any farther in that direction.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is not the coat you have on made of imported stuff?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why did you not buy a coat of American stuff and thereby help some poor American workingman?

Mr. WALKER. Because I prefer to help "some poor American workingman" by buying this, on which I gladly pay double and treble in tax to my Government [laughter] and ought to pay it.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. You said a moment ago that you always employ or that the body of manufacturers always employ skilled European laborers that come over here. What have you to say about that? That is not in harmony with what you have just stated about your anxiety to put money into the pockets of the poor American laborer.

Mr. WALKER. I think that in view of the style of questions the gentleman is asking I must decline to be further interrupted by him.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Very well; I do not blame you.

Mr. WALKER. The reason is that the moment a foreign laborer lands upon our soil he is by that act an American. The moment a foreigner touches his foot upon the deck of an American ship at Liverpool, Hongkong, New York, or New Orleans he demands and gets American wages, he is an American, he is treated as an American under the law, he is protected by our flag, and he is my brother.

Mr. Chairman, I have some returns here of the percentages on woolen goods cotton goods, leather, boots and shoes, and other goods. In every \$1 worth of, cheap all-wool goods the cost of the wool is 52½ cents, the labor is 25 per cent., and the expenses 21 per cent. The expenses are always counted with the labor in the tariff, because the whole expense account from beginning to end is made up of wages in one form or another back to the raw material.



## LABOR AND MATERIAL.

You say if you had free wool you could enter and capture "the markets of the world." If the wool costs us 52 cents and the labor costs 48 cents, are not they just as much inexorably fixed in cost, whether labor or material? And if your labor on woollens costs you, as it does, 24 cents more in this country than it costs in England, are you not just as much at a disadvantage as you would be if the excess of 24 cents was in the raw material item? Is not that a perfectly clear proposition? If your labor is 50 per cent. and your raw material 50 per cent., and you take off 25 per cent. of the cost from the raw material, making half to the Englishman, the Englishman can thus beat you in all the markets of the world. Is it not just the same as if he got his labor for just half what it costs you? What difference is it whether the labor is 50 cents to the Englishman and the material 25, or whether the material is 50 and the labor 25, when each are 50 in America?

I tell you, gentlemen, that labor to the extent that it enters into an article is just as much an element of cost and as inexorably fixed in cost as raw material. It is just so with cotton goods, boots and shoes, leather, and every other thing manufactured. I must submit to you the following statistics and say to you that the labor cost in every one of them, in the best equipped factories in Europe, as compared with our best equipped factories, is practically one-half as much there as here. That, and that only, excepting in woollens, is what hinders us from taking every market in the world, in every manufactured thing, from England, provided we will take the same means to get them she has taken to get them. In boots, shoes, and leather she has not adopted our system of manufacturing, because the tariff keeps her out of our market, and in those things she is going along more on the old system.

## WOOLEN GOODS.

[Duty on wool in goods, 11 cents.]

Manufacturers and articles.	Wool.	Labor.	General ex-penses, etc.	Total.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
An. Co., all-wool dress goods.....	52.47	25.83	21.70	100
Various companies:				
No. 1, very low-grade-all-wool piece dyed cheviots.....	62.00	25.00	13.00	100
No. 2, medium quality, all-wool beaver.....	60.00	26.00	14.00	100
No. 3, highest grade of fur beaver, all wool.....	58.50	22.50	19.00	100

## COTTON GOODS.

Manufacturers and articles.	Labor.	General ex-penses, etc.	Cotton.	Total.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
FINE GOODS.				
Ly. Co.:				
Fancy weave—				
No. 72, weight 11.50.....	46.50	18.50	35.00	100
No. 70, weight 8.75.....	50.50	22.00	27.50	100
No. 48, weight 7.50.....	47.00	20.50	32.50	100
COARSE GOODS.				
L. Co.:				
No. 23, weight 4.....	31.50	13.00	55.50	100
No. 13, weight 2.85.....	23.50	10.00	66.50	100
Denims, No. 11, weight 2.50.....	26.50	23.00	50.50	100
A. Co.:				
Denims, No. 11, weight 2.25.....	28.00	23.00	49.00	100
Ginghams, No. 26, weight 6.....	45.25	21.75	33.00	100

The No. is the number of yarn, No. 13 being coarse sheetings, such as are sent to China. Denims and Ginghams are colored goods dyed in the yarn. The others are plain. The weight is the number of yards in the pound.



## A.—Items in the cost in percentages of heavy farmer's boots.

Items.	Upper leather.*		Sole leather.†	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Hide.....	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Bark :		63.2		72.0
Stumpage.....	(1.0)	} 6.2	(3.0)	} 17.0
Labor.....	5.2			
Other material :				
Crude.....	(1.0)	} 7.0		
Labor.....	6.0			
Beam-house and yard labor.....	4.6	4.6	5.0	5.0
Curry-shop labor.....	8.5	8.5		
Odd labor.....	3.6	3.6		
Expense.....	6.9	6.9	6.0	6.0
Total labor items.....	34.8		25.0	
Total.....		100.0		100.0

\* Four months in process.

† Eight months in process.

Items.	Heavy calf.		Light calf.	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Hide.....	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Bark :		52.0		50.0
Stumpage.....	(1.0)	} 7.0	(1.0)	} 6.0
Labor.....	6.0			
Other material :				
Crude.....	(1.0)	} 8.0	(1.0)	} 8.0
Labor.....	7.0			
Beam-house and yard labor.....	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Curry-shop labor.....	14.0	14.0	16.0	16.0
Odd labor.....	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Expense.....	11.0	11.0	13.0	13.0
Total labor items.....	46.0		48.0	
Total.....		100.0		100.0

## Items in the cost in percentages of—

Items.	B.—Upper leather boot.		C.—Split boot.	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Upper leather :	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Hide.....		28.0		22.0
Labor.....	17.0	17.0	13.0	13.0
Sole leather :				
Hide.....		17.0		19.0
Labor.....	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0
Labor.....	23.0	23.00	29.0	29.0
Findings.....	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0
Expense.....	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Total labor items.....	55.0		59.0	
Total.....		100.0		100.0



## Items in the cost in percentages of—

Items.	D.—Men's 1-1 double-sole pegged first quality grain plow shoe.*		E.—Men's upper leather first quality \$1 brogan, 1-1 double sole.*	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Sole leather:	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Hide.....		21.5		22.5
Labor.....	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Upper leather:				
Hide.....		21.0		24.0
Labor.....	13.0	13.0	15.0	15.0
Labor.....	20.5	20.5	18.0	18.5
Findings.....	7.5	7.5	5.5	5.5
Expense.....	8.5	8.5	6.5	6.5
Total labor items.....	57.5		53.0	
Total.....		100.0		100.0

Items.	F.—Best kid, 16 inch, \$2, 1-2 double sole boot.		G.—Heavy split, 16 inch, \$1.50, double sole and tap boot.	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Sole leather:	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Hide.....		18.2		21.0
Labor.....	6.0	6.0	8.0	8.0
Upper leather:				
Hide.....		30.0		24.0
Labor.....	18.0	18.0	15.0	15.0
Labor.....	20.8	20.8	24.2	24.2
Findings.....	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.5
Expense.....	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.3
Total labor items.....	51.8		55.0	
Total.....		100.0		100.0

Items.	H.—Fine shoe, hand welt, \$3.50, calf skin.*		I.—Fine shoe, Goodyear, \$2.50, calf skin.*	
	Labor cost.	Total.	Labor cost.	Total.
Sole leather:	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Hide.....		18.0		22.6
Labor.....	7.0	7.0	8.0	8.0
Upper leather:				
Hide.....		17.1		14.7
Labor.....	16.0	16.0	13.0	13.0
Labor.....	32.7	32.7	31.2	31.2
Findings.....	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Expense.....	5.1	5.1	6.7	6.7
Total labor items.....	64.8		62.7	
Total.....		100.0		100.0

\*Sixty days in process.

Mr. Chairman, now I come to another branch of the subject. It is a law of economics, with but few exceptions, that when the volume of a product is increased the price of each unit is proportionately decreased, and when the volume of the product is decreased the price of each unit is correspondingly increased.



## A FIVE-SET WOOLEN MILL FOR BLUE JEANS.

Five sets average to cost \$15,000 a set.....		\$75,000.00
To run it the fixed charges will be ;		
Agent.....	2,500.00	
Office expenses.....	1,200.00	
Three bosses at \$900.....	2,700.00	
Engineer.....	750.00	
Coal.....	2,100.00	
Incidentals.....	2,500.00	
		11,750.00
Taxes.....		1,125.00
Renewal and repairs, 10 per cent.....		7,500.00
		20,375.00
Annual capacity, 442,000 yards. at 30 cents.....		132,600.00
Stock and labor.....	\$108,475.00	
Fixed charges.....	20,375.00	
Profit 5 per cent. on \$75,000 plant.....	3,750.00	
		132,600.00
Running half the machinery, the product would be 221,000 yards per annum, at 30 cents.....		\$66,300.00
Stock and labor (half).....	\$54,237.50	
Fixed charges the same.....	20,375.00	
		74,612.50
11.8 per cent. actual loss on business done.....	8,312.50	66,300.00

Something could probably be saved in fixed charges, and would be if a hope was not indulged that the mill would soon run full capacity. Nothing is reckoned for use of live capital.

For a mill for middle grade, the "fixed charges" are much more. For making the highest grade cloth the "fixed charges" are at least 25 per cent more. In such a mill one to four "designers" are employed.

## A COTTON MILL FOR PRINT CLOTHS

of 30,000 spindles will cost \$20 a spindle.....		\$600,000.00
Fixed charges :		
Agent.....	3,000.00	
Office expenses.....	3,000.00	
Five bosses at \$1,000.....	5,000.00	
Engineer.....	1,000.00	
Fireman.....	750.00	
Coal.....	2,500.00	
Incidentals.....	2,500.00	
		17,750.00
Taxes.....		9,000.00
Renewal and repairs, 10 per cent.....		60,000.00
		86,750.00
Total.....		86,750.00
Annual capacity, 1,560,000 pounds of cotton; result, 7 yards to the pound, 10,920,000 yards, at .03.....		\$27,600.00
Stock and labor.....	\$210,850.00	
26.48 per cent fixed charges on product.....	86,750.00	
		297,600.00
Total cost of product.....		327,600.00
Five per cent on \$600,000 plant.....	30,000.00	
		327,600.00
Running at half capacity would produce 5,460,000, at 3 cents.....		163,800.00
Stock and labor (half).....	\$105,425.00	
52.96 per cent fixed charges on product.....	86,750.00	
		192,175.00
Total cost of product.....		23,625.00
4.73 per cent actual loss on business done.....		163,800.00

As mills are arranged for higher grade cottons the fixed charges are proportionately higher.

## FIREARMS FACTORY.

Plant.....		\$150,000.00
Interest on quick capital, insurance, repairs, building and running machinery.....		15,000.00
Office help, foreman, engineer, taxes, coal, etc.....		10,000.00
		25,000.00
Making fixed charges.....		25,000.00
100 men produce \$125,000; fixed charges 20 per cent.....		25,000.00
<b>Not a dollar made.</b>		
300 men produce.....		\$75,000.00
Fixed charges the same 6 2/3 per cent.....		25,000.00
Price reduced 5 per cent; profit 9 1/2 per cent.....		35,000.00



The 20 per cent, all of which was absorbed in expense on goods, is now divided into expense, 6 $\frac{2}{3}$ ; price reduced, 5, and profit, 9 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent.

It is within my knowledge that a shoe factory in Massachusetts in 1891 made 3,000,000 pairs of shoes, selling them for \$2,000,000, and the profit made on them was 2 cents a pair a little over 1 per cent. on the sales. Another large shoe factory in Massachusetts within my knowledge made 2 per cent on the capital invested. Another concern in the same business, and one of the largest in the State, in the last three years averaged to make 40 cents on a case of 12 pairs each, and that was a larger profit than is usually reached.

#### A CHENILLE FACTORY.

But, Mr. Chairman, the McKinley tariff increased the output fourfold on table covers alone. Before the tariff few covers could be made in this country, and only a limited quantity of portieres. The entire output of the different mills in Philadelphia has been increased a million and a half dollars yearly on covers and portieres through the McKinley tariff, and as American manufacturers have been given this opportunity they are now developing such taste in designs that the goods are being sold in London to a considerable extent, with the promise of a very large business abroad, which, without the encouragement of the McKinley tariff, would never have been done.

The weavers on these goods are making at an average about \$15 per week.

#### NOTTINGHAM LACES.

This industry is virtually a direct result of the McKinley tariff. The present product in Philadelphia alone is 30,000 pairs of lace curtains a week, and, while there are ship-loads imported, the American manufacturers will in two years, in the judgment of first-class authority, stop the importation of these goods and bring all the business to this country.

This statement was made only yesterday by a Nottingham importer, who bewailed the condition of the business abroad. This, of course, is a great help to the cotton-yarn business, and the increase in this direction ought to be very large.

The Nottingham lace-weavers are the best paid weavers in England, but the menders and subsequent operatives, who handle the curtains after they are woven, which is a large item in expense, are very poorly paid. In England they get about \$3 a week. In America they get between \$10 and \$12 per week.

Mr. Chairman, this new industry was brought into existence by the McKinley tariff bill—the manufacture of chenilles, established in Philadelphia and all made of cotton. These chenilles were sold at from \$15 to \$18 a set before the McKinley bill went into operation. I believe an inferior kind sold at a cheaper rate, perhaps some of them as low as \$12. They are sold all over the country and in Europe to-day at \$10 a set. The McKinley bill increased the demand fourfold, and they are now employing in that manufactory 2,800 men. Before that bill went into operation it was scarcely a paying business. Now they are sold at from \$10 to \$10.50 a set; simply because they can make them in immense quantities and for that reason make them much cheaper. If they made only the same quantity as was made before that bill went into operation they would have to get \$15 to \$18 a set in order to make anything. But making them in immense quantities they can sell them at \$10.50 a set and make money, and if we keep up that tariff for a while longer these same sets will be sold at from \$5 to \$7 in all the markets of the country. These will be sent to Europe in time.

Our farmers and mechanics have so much more money to spend that they can buy goods of that kind. In Europe, on the contrary, the market is limited and they can not afford to run machinery and incur all of the expense necessary for making them in large quantities while there is a limited demand. But the very moment that we get a market there, sufficient to warrant these people in building their own factory, they will build it and do their own work of that character. They will follow the example set by this country as soon as the market is large enough for them. The same condition of things will prevail as was seen in regard to the sewing machine; we sold them every sewing machine they used until their people were educated in the use of it, and then they built their own factories and now you can not sell a sewing machine in Europe.

For like reason we need the tariff just as much to-day as we ever needed it, because if we do not have it they will, by the use of their cheap labor and Ameri-



can improved machinery, cut us out of a very important market for the surplus products of this country. It should be remembered that it does not cost as much to transport goods from Europe to this country to-day as it did twenty years ago to send a cargo of freight across the Mississippi river opposite St. Louis. There is not a single mechanic who does not know that the only way he can keep up his wages in this country is by combination or by trades unions, and I glory in their having them. If trades unions are to be extended all over this country to protect themselves so as to get the same wages in all parts of the country, then this country under the protective tariff is as a great trades union, and is effective to protect our workmen from foreign wage competition and European rates of wages.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. WALKER. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I want to ask whether it is true that you are connected with the boot and shoe manufacturing industry? I understood that you were.

Mr. WALKER. I was up to 1888. Since then I have been out of that business.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Was it not true that you had your raw material free? I mean the hides, etc.?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Is it not equally true that you exported largely yourself?

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; and no one else exported.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Is it not true that the boot and leather manufacturers do export their products?

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; that is not true.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. No leather goods?

Mr. WALKER. Yes; they export leather.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. And they successfully compete on the other side with those who manufacture the same line of goods here, do they not?

Mr. WALKER. Do you mean the same kind of leather?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALKER. They never saw any such leather as we make here, and never had any at all, until within twenty years. I mean hides split into two or more thicknesses of leather.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. What is the benefit of protection, then?

Mr. WALKER. Do you mean the benefit to us?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. No; you are not in the business, you say.

Mr. WALKER. I beg your pardon; I am manufacturing about 3,000 calfskins a day. That is being in manufacturing to some extent, I think.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I thought you said you were out of the business.

Mr. WALKER. I am not in the boot and shoe business.

#### THE DUTY ON HIDES.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I misunderstood the gentleman. How does the protective tariff benefit you if you are exporting the leather? And pardon one more question. Is it true that you went before the Ways and Means Committee of the last Congress and insisted that there should be no tariff on hides?

Mr. WALKER. It is absolutely untrue. Not only that, but let me say to you that there never was a greater curse to this country, considering the amount of money involved, than the taking the duty off of hides, which was done in 1872 or '73. You took the duty off hides at the earnest solicitation of gentlemen in New York engaged in making sole leather.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Do you mean the Democrats did it?

Mr. WALKER. No; the Republicans did it.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Well, you said we did it. You know I am a Democrat.

Mr. WALKER. I say it was in the line of your theories, in the line of what you are now talking, what you now believe in, the beautiful free-trade theory.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. The Republicans were free-traders then, to that extent, at that time.

Mr. WALKER. They were deceived to the extent which I will tell you, if you will allow me to. We took the duty off hides in 1872, in order that we might export a product having less labor in it almost than pig iron—I refer to sole leather—and we cut down millions and millions of acres of our forests, and allowed much of the lumber to rot in the woods the fore part of the period and our streams to dry up in order that we might make this miserable product (so far as skilled



labor is concerned), sole leather, and ship it to Europe, and denuded our country of our forests and thus dried up our streams.

No greater curse has come to this country than has resulted from our attempting to manufacture sole leather for Europe; and if we had kept the duty on hides in 1872, in the last fifteen years, at least, the farmer would have got from 70 cents to \$1 more for every neat animal he sold, and from 10 to 20 cents for every calf; and it was an outrage on the farmers of this country when the duty was taken off from hides.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Will you pardon another question?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Has not the Republican party been repeatedly in power since that time, both in the House, the Senate, and the Presidency? And have they not carried on that policy ever since, and is it not a part of their policy now? Another question which I wish to ask before you sit down is this: Is it true that the boots and shoes used by the working people of this country are sold as cheaply in this country as they are in the old country?

Mr. WALKER. To the first question. It is much easier to do a wrong than to correct one, especially in the face of Democratic opposition to right doing. To the second, I say, more cheaply.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Well, then, why do you ask for protection? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. That question, to a man who is familiar—

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I am asking you seriously.

Mr. WALKER. If you were as familiar with the facts as I am, the question would not be creditable to you.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I confess my ignorance, and ask I you for information.

Mr. WALKER. I doubt that; I think it for quite another purpose, but I will give you the information just the same. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. That is a political reply.

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; it is a true reply. You are not asking for information, but in order to confound me with your theories.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I certainly am asking for information; because you said that if I knew as much about it as you did, my question would not be a creditable to me; and I confess that, not being in that business, I do not know as much about it: but it seems strange to me that if you can sell your goods more cheaply in this country than in the old country you should need any protection against the manufacturers of the old country here in the home market.

#### BOOTS AND SHOES.

Mr. WALKER. Here, as in all other things, you ignore and despise facts. Mr. Chairman, the tariff on boots and shoes, in proportion to the labor in them, is about a third what it is on other goods. So we have cut the tariff down by two-thirds for the reason you have suggested. Secondly, all the manufacturing of boots and shoes that is done in Europe is done on an entirely different plan from the plan in this country. It is done on the old plan of fifty years ago, exactly in the same way, but in immense factories, as my grandfather did it in his old shop, excepting that they are using machinery as we are, where he had only hand work, eighty years ago.

That is to say, they are manufacturing all kinds of goods from men's wear of the coarsest kind to men's wear of the finest kind, and women's wear of the coarsest kind to the finest kind, in one factory.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. You are—

Mr. WALKER. I would like to talk a little, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. You are giving the reason why they are cheaper.

Mr. WALKER. I will give you the reasons if you will allow me.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Certainly I will.

Mr. WALKER. That is the system of manufacture in Great Britain. They can not begin to manufacture as cheaply there, under that system, hour for hour, in what they produce, and this is true of many other things. Therefore that system is a protection to us in this country to a very large extent. Here the factories run on one thing—one shoe. You would be surprised, if you are not familiar with it, to know from how many different factories what you find in a retail shoe store comes. I presume every style of shoe you would see comes from a different factory;



and for that reason they are made a great deal cheaper here than they can be made in England. Now, then, if the gentleman will give me his attention.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. I am listening to you very closely.

Mr. WALKER. If we run factories as they do in England; if we were manufacturing everything by precisely the same process as they are, we should need more protection than we now have. If we took off the tariff and opened our market to England they would immediately adopt our system of making each style in a different factory, very largely so, for our market, and our wages for our laborers would have to come down to the same wages that they pay or they would sell every boot and shoe to us and close up every factory in this country. Have I made that clear?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. From your standpoint, yes.

Mr. WALKER. I would make the whole question of protection clear, and if I have failed to do so it is because I have felt under tremendous pressure for occupying the time of the House to such an unreasonable length. Still, I want to go a little further, as the matter has been called to my attention by the gentleman.

*Table showing increase in exports of certain articles.*

Exports of—	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Cotton goods.....	\$4,734,424	\$104,93,796	\$3,787,282	\$10,467,651	\$9,999,277
Boots and shoes.....	193,598	782,525	419,612	441,069	662,973
Sole leather.....	}	674,309	106,312	5,744,360	{ 6,420,134
Upper leather.....					
Total.....	4,928,022	12,391,630	4,313,206	16,653,080	21,331,495
Total increase for the years given over ten years previous.....		7,463,608	8,078,424	12,339,874	4,678,115
Increase per capita.....		24 cents		24 cents	7 cents
Woolen goods.....			124,159	775,962	437,479

Again, we practically have all raw material free for goods to export, as all duties that have been paid on any articles entering into goods exported are returned to exporter.

By the above table it is seen that in the year 1850 we exported cotton goods. I want to call particular attention to this, and I hope my friend from Texas will notice these figures, because they are very interesting. In 1860 we exported per capita of all cotton goods, of boots and shoes, of sole leather and upper leather, and all other sorts of leather, 24 cents per capita more than in 1850. In 1870, of course, we exported nothing, because of inflation and disturbed financial conditions. In 1880 we exported 24 cents in value per capita more than in 1870. In 1890 we exported only 7 cents per capita more than in 1880.

Now, will the free traders tell us why, if we exported of cotton goods, boots and shoes, sole leather, upper leather, and all made with free raw material from the beginning to the end, the increase has gone down from 24 cents per capita in 1860 to 7 cents a head, what reason have you to think with our labor cost twice that of England, why, I say, do you think we can "take the markets of the world" on woolen goods with free wool? Can you give me any good reason for the faith that is in you?

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Do you want an answer?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. The reason why there was such a decrease was because the manufacturers, anticipating the high rate of tariff fixed by the McKinley bill, and knowing that the prices at home would be largely increased by the operations of that bill, kept their goods at home for sale.

Mr. WALKER. I hope the reporter got it all.

Mr. CLAIN of Texas. He got it.

Mr. WALKER. That is a fair sample, with all due deference to the gentleman, of the absolute, dense ignorance, black even to midnight [laughter], of free traders concerning manufacturing and trade conditions and of the utter worthlessness of all this free trade talk. [Laughter.] Leather! Boots and Shoes! Higher! Leather and boots and shoes never were so cheap since the sun shone or water



ran. They are cheaper since the McKinley bill went into operation than ever, and everybody knows that is true, excepting free trade politicians.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. From free hides.

Mr. WALKER. We have had free hides ever since 1872.

Mr. PENDLETON. Well, they are coming in more and more. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; what nonsense! One thing, and the only thing, that hinders us from taking the export markets is our higher wages. Now, Mr. Chairman, since they have waked me up again I am going to discuss a little the question of our foreign trade.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. If your statement be correct, why do you not repeal the McKinley tariff?

Mr. WALKER. For the reasons that I have given twenty times, and I wish you would not ask me to give them again. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILGORE). The gentleman from Texas is out of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has the floor.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. The gentleman from Massachusetts allowed me to ask him a question.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I intended to give him the floor to ask a question, but I did not expect the same question so many times. If there is anybody at fault in this case it is I and not my friend from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

#### INCREASE IN WOOL AND COTTON MANUFACTURES.

The following tables are a remarkable exhibit. They show that the increase in manufacturing in the woolen industry with a heavy duty on wool, is very much greater than in the cotton industry with free cotton. In fact, they show that the free trade theory is absolutely wrong, that it is not supported by a single fact in the economic history of this country, or any other country. From 1860 the increase of woolen goods was about 99 per cent per capita. From 1860 to 1870, under trials such as few countries have seen, it increased more than three and a half times as much as from 1850 to 1860—\$3.55 a head. Under the terrible strain of resumption, between 1870 and 1880, it increased as much as from 1850 to 1860 under a free trade tariff—99 cents a head—while under normal conditions, from 1880 to 1890, under a protective tariff that has been reduced by the McKinley bill, as I have shown, nearly 30 per cent on all imports, the woolen trade increased nearly twice as much as in the decade from 1870 to 1880, and half as much as between 1860 and 1870:

Table showing increase in number of establishments, number of hands employed, for periods of ten years, etc.

CARPETS.	1850-1860	1860-1870	1870-1880	1880-1890
Increase in number of establishments.....		4	—20	—20
Increase in number hands employed.....		5,417	8,273	8,818
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....	\$2,456,402	\$13,903,937	\$10,031,229	\$16,008,697
Increase per capita in ten years.....	\$ .07	\$0.36	\$0.20	\$0.252
HOSIERY AND KNIT GOODS.				
Increase in number of establishments.....		51	111	448
Increase in number hands employed.....		5,685	14,097	34,119
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....	\$6,252,504	\$11,130,958	\$10,755,663	\$37,470,215
Increase per capita in ten years.....	\$0.91	\$0.29	\$0.214	\$0.508
WOOLEN GOODS.				
Increase in number of establishments.....	—299	1,631	—901	—678
Increase in number hands employed.....	2,108	38,693	6,451	7,116
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....	\$18,687,441	\$93,894,986	\$5,201,363	\$26,993,894
Increase per capita in ten years.....	\$0.594	\$2.423	\$0.103	—\$0.431
WORSTED GOODS.				
Increase in number of establishments.....		99	—26	67
Increase in number of hands employed.....		10,542	5,883	25,790
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....		\$18,298,953	\$11,549,611	\$45,644,710
Increase per capita in ten years.....		\$0.474	\$0.23	\$0.727



Table showing increase in number of establishments, number of hands employed, etc., for periods of ten years, etc.—Continued.

FELT GOODS.	1850-1860.	1860-1870.	1870-1880.	1880-1890.
Increase in the number of establishments.....				8
Increase in number of hands employed.....				742
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....				\$1,035,116
Increase per capita in ten years.....				0.01
WOOL HATS.				
Increase in the number of establishments.....				-11
Increase in number of hands employed.....				1,578
Total product:				
Increase in ten years.....				\$3,186,648
Increase per capita in ten years.....				0.03
TOTAL.				
Increase in number of establishments.....	114	1,783	906	-186
Increase in number of hands employed.....	20,270	60,337	41,698	59,475
Increase in product in ten years.....	\$31,097,725	\$136,844,220	\$49,674,087	\$111,978,196
Increase in product per capita in ten years.....	\$0.989	\$3.546	\$0.99	\$1.788

It must be entirely clear to all candid men that free wool can not by any possibility aid our manufacturers of woolen goods to secure "the markets of the world" to any greater extent than our free cotton has enabled our manufacturers of cotton goods to secure "the markets of the world," or our free hides have enabled our manufacturers of boots and shoes to secure "the markets of the world."

The item of cost in cotton goods, boots, and shoes or in leather that prevents us from exporting them is not the material from which they are made, but because the labor cost in our goods which is from one-half as high again to three times as high as in European countries.

Cotton manufacturing.	1850-1860.	1860-1870.	1870-1880.	1880-1890.
Increase in number of establishments in each ten years.....	3	135	40	76
Increase in number hands in each ten years.....	29,742	13,841	50,103	40,552
Increase of total product in each ten years.....	\$50,180,087	\$61,807,965	\$33,460,644	\$57,128,475
Increase per capita in each ten years.....	\$1.595	\$1.601	\$0.666	\$0.912

The cotton industry increased 61.3 per cent. per capita over the wools from 1850 to 1860; the woolen industry increased 121.5 per cent. per capita over the cotton from 1860 to 1870; the woolen industry increased 48.5 per cent. per capita over the cotton from 1870 to 1880; the woolen industry increased 94.2 per cent. per capita over the cotton from 1880 to 1890, with heavy duties on wool and none on cotton.

Statistics of all branches of cotton manufacture, 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880.

## COTTON.

Year.	Number of establishments.	Total number of hands employed.	Total number pounds of cotton consumed.	Total value of product.
1850.....	1,094	92,286	288,558,000	\$65,501,687
1860.....	1,091	122,028	422,704,975	115,681,774
1870.....	956	135,369	398,308,257	177,489,739
1880.....	1,005	*185,472	766,749,347	210,950,383
1890†.....	929	226,024	1,076,515,300	268,078,858

\*Includes 2,115 officers and clerks whose salaries were not reported under the amount of wages paid.

†Estimated.



Statistics of all Branches of wool manufacture. [Census years 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890.]

Year and branch of industry.	Establishments reported.		Hands employed.		Wool consumed.			Total value of all products.
	Number.	Number.	Number.	Pounds.	Domestic.	Foreign.	Not specified.	
1850.								
Carpets.....								
Hosiery and knit goods.....								
Woolen goods.....	1,559	39,252						\$5,401,284
Total.....	1,559	39,252						1,028,102
								43,207,545
								49,686,881
1860.								
Carpets.....								
Hosiery and knit goods.....	213	6,681						7,857,696
Woolen goods.....	197	9,103						7,250,606
Worsted goods.....	1,260	41,360						61,894,968
Total.....	3	2,378			3,000,000			3,701,378
	1,678	59,822			3,000,000			80,734,606
1870.								
Carpets.....								
Hosiery and knit goods.....	215	12,908						21,761,573
Woolen goods.....	248	14,788						18,411,564
Worsted goods.....	2,801	80,063			5,304,656			153,403,358
Total.....	102	12,920			13,317,319			22,000,331
	3,456	119,859			173,389,069			217,578,826
1880 &c								
Carpets.....								
Hosiery and knit goods (half cotton stock in pounds).....	195	20,371						31,792,802
Woolen goods.....	359	28,855			2,029,318			29,167,227
Worsted goods.....	1,990	86,504			8,146,137			169,606,721
Felt goods.....	76	18,803			177,042,288			33,649,942
Wool Hats.....	26	1,524			25,461,611			3,619,652
Total.....	43	5,470			4,204,806			8,516,569
	2,089	161,557			6,197,471			267,252,913
					222,991,531	73,200,698		
					2,029,318	34,008,252		
					8,146,137	448,758		
					177,042,288	20,482,667		
					25,461,611	15,687,815		
					4,204,806	709,067		
					6,197,471	1,864,139		
					222,991,531	21,441,106		
					2,145,632			
					18,985,089			
					168,525,806			
					59,832,451			
					5,039,495			
					4,278,628			
					258,757,101			
					221,032	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			
					45,593			
					2,266			
					32			
					2,503			
					258,757,101	114,116,612		
					29,189			
					63,004			
					79,588			



During the whole inflation period, from 1862 to 1879, not only were all duties payable in gold, but all goods imported were also paid for in gold. Therefore the average premium on gold each year was the exact equivalent of increasing the duty on every dollar's worth of our importation in its increasing the price of all things imported and in stimulating manufactures.

In year—	Average gold rates of duties on all imports was—	Gold premium.	Practically a per cent duty of—	Combined premium on duties was in—
1862.....	26.08+	47.0	= 43.1	1871=50.8
1863.....	28.28+	212.3	=240.6	1872=49.0
1864.....	32.03+	118.3	=150.6	1873=39.5
1865.....	38.46+	81.4	=119.5	1874=38.6
1866.....	41.81+	46.4	= 88.2	1875=42.3
1867.....	44.56+	39.2	= 83.6	1876=42.0
1868.....	46.49+	41.0	= 87.5	1877=31.9
1869.....	44.65+	41.0	= 85.6	1878=28.2
1870.....	42.23+	16.6	= 58.8	1879=29.0

From 1862 to 1870 the average duty was 87.5.

It will be seen by the figures in the wool and cotton table and on the tariff that this practically tremendous increase in duties during the nine years from 1862 to 1870, had a tremendous effect in developing the industries of the country, followed of course by the depression of business from 1870 to 1880, during resumption of specie payments, such as always follows such extravagant inflation. The average duty during the period from 1860 to 1870 was 87.5, and, as I have said, the woolen industry during that period increased three and a half fold, and the cotton industry increased half as much again as between 1880 and 1890. These manufacturing industries were practically brought into being under the embargo of the war of 1812.

#### FOREIGN TRADE.

Mr. Chairman, a word more about foreign trade. This country can build up a foreign trade of millions upon millions if you will only give us the same mail facilities and the same steamship facilities from our ports to South American and other ports that the English have. Give us those facilities and we will build up a trade of millions. We can not do it in staples. We can not do it on things that come, as staple goods do, in competition with what is largely made in England. But—and I want gentlemen to give their attention to this—a people like ours, whose plane of consumption is three times as high as that of England even, and eight times as high as that of the rest of the world—the economic wants of such a people, their tastes, their demands, are all upon that high plane, and they demand styles and kinds and qualities of goods that are not salable in large quantities except in their own country.

Now, the surplus of our factories, of goods of that character we can export to the amount of millions of dollars if you will only give us a chance. That is, we can sell them in small lots all over the world, a little in one place and a little in another place, but in the aggregate amounting to a vast sum. That is, we can do it if you will give us a fair chance to do it. This is illustrated by sewing machines, by revolving firearms, by boot and shoe machinery, and by all our agricultural machinery. We exported those things until we had educated the foreigners to use them, and then they built their own factories, and they have been taking away from us, one year one thing and another year another thing.

However, we keep ahead of them. As they take one thing from us we develop another in our protected factories, and our foreign trade, promoted in this way, will continue to increase year by year if you will keep up this system of protection. Here is a watch. I am so constituted that I can go without as well as anyone, but if I have a thing I want the best. During the war I had a watch that did not keep good time, and I would wake up and get to thinking about my business, whether that watch had stopped or not, and it caused me a great deal of worry, so I said "I will have the best watch there is made," and I paid for this Jurgensen watch, including the heavy premium on gold, very nearly \$465.



Mr. SCOTT. Why did not you patronize an American watchmaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. My dear man, there were no such watches made in this country at that time. That is the reason. Now, let me say to my friend of Illinois [Mr. Scott]—

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois (interposing). I want to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that under the protective tariff law, since he purchased that foreign-made watch, we have established in my district the largest watch factory in the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. Oh, my good friend, do not make my speech. It is poor enough, I know, and I do not want you to dig under it. [Laughter.] When my friend from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] sees a good thing he wants to go for it at once.

Mr. DAVIS. Out in our country some of the people that pay this tariff upon watches and other things are so poor that they do not wear gold watches.

#### THE AMERICAN DUPLICATE SYSTEM.

Mr. WALKER. Now, that is not greatly to the gentleman's credit. That is not serious discussion of a great question in the United States House of Representatives. [Laughter.] Let me say to you, gentlemen, that by means of the "duplicate system," an American invention, though not a patentable invention at all, we have so broadened this watch business that you can buy now for \$100 an American-made watch that is better than this \$465 Jurgensen watch was ever represented to be.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Let me ask the gentleman whether it is not true that two of those American watch factories were running at the very time he bought that watch of his, if he bought it during the war, and that one of those factories was in Massachusetts?

Mr. WALKER. Oh, they were running; just as sewing-machine factories and reaper and mower factories were running, but had only begun.

Mr. SCOTT. But you said that they were not running at all.

Mr. WALKER. Not at all. I say now that, economically, they were not running. [Laughter.] What I mean to say is that watches of this kind were not made in this country at that time. I did not mean to say that no watches were made. Any gentleman who says that watches of this kind were made here at the time when I bought this watch simply shows that he does not know what he is talking about. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROCKWELL. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. WALKER. Oh, do let me have a little of my own time. [Laughter.] Now, let me repeat that at the time to which I refer, when I bought this watch, watches of its kind were not made here at all. There were watches made at Waltham and subsequently at Elgin, but not of this quality. I know all about this watch business. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROCKWELL. The reason I asked the question was because I bought my first watch at that same time, during the war, and it kept just as good time and was just as good a watch as any foreign one.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, I understand. That is the way they all do. Every woman's baby is the handsomest. [Laughter.] Now, I say, gentlemen, that by adopting the duplicate system we have so cheapened the manufacture that you can buy for \$10 a watch that is better, that keeps better time, and wears longer than an imported watch for which you had to pay \$40 when we first began to make them in this country, and it all comes from American inventiveness.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas. Not from the tariff? [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. The point is, that they could take the Waltham machinery or the Elgin machinery over to Switzerland to-day and set it up there and work with cheap labor and run out every watch factory in this country. My friend from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] says, let them do it; my friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] says, let them do it; my friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] says, let them do it. All you Democrats say, let them do it, and let the American watchmakers and all other American mechanics go out and starve or work for European wages. I say, no, never.