

PROTECTION: AN ADDRESS, BY HON. S. B. ELKINS.

— Delivered at —

WHEELING, W. VA., OCTOBER 22, 1890.

An Unanswerable Argument, Full of Facts and Figures
Against Free Trade Theories and Sophistries.

*It always gives me great pleasure to come to Wheeling, and especially am I pleased to address a Wheeling audience. In this place I always feel that the subject of protection never runs dry or grows stale.

The story of the rise and supremacy of the Republican party in this country, of its lofty purposes, noble endeavors, great achievements in war and in peace, and the things it has done in the interest of humanity and good government, will be told with pride as long as popular government lasts, liberty survives, and man loves his fellow man. In this story material will be found for some future Homer, thousands of years hence, perhaps in another Iliad, to sing the glories that came to the great Republic in the first century of its existence. The Republican party is proud of the history it has made. It will stand out boldly among the grandest chapters in the annals of time.

Sixty-five millions of free, contented, happy and prosperous people are today indebted to the Republican party for the Union and the government under which they live. No greater or more difficult problems in administration and government were ever presented to a political party than these that met the Republican party on the threshold of its existence. No greater trials and responsibilities were ever laid on a political party, and none were ever so courageously, patriotically and successfully met.

The mighty results wrought out by the Republican party are only equalled by those of our forefathers who fought for our independence and founded the Union. Time and history have amply vindicated the Republican party in the wisdom of all of its undertakings. Every step it took more than a quarter of a century ago in carrying out its great purposes, subduing the rebellion, liberating the slaves, providing a national currency, and establishing the national credit was persistently opposed by the Democratic party; yet there is not a Democrat in all this broad land who does not now rejoice that the Republican party succeeded in all these matters of national concern, and that we now have one country, one people, and one flag that floats over "The land of the free and the home of the brave."

But the Republican party does not live in the past, nor upon the past, nor does it prosper upon the fleeting prejudices and passions of time. It trusts in, lives and grows upon the ever-unfolding but always abiding principles of liberty, truth and justice. It makes no appeal for a continuance of power on account of its splendid record in war and peace, great and glorious as it is. In the present campaign it asks for a renewal of popular confidence and support upon the record it has made on the pending political issues of the day. It believes that what it now proposes is best for the people and best for the country. That the interests of trade, commerce, manufacturing and agriculture, and the fortunes and destinies of the Republic can with more safety be committed to its care and keeping than that of the Democratic party.

The Republican party, aggressive, progressive and national in all its aims and purposes, claims, in spite of Democratic opposition, mad, mistaken and misguided as in the past, that it will move forward to do the great work it has in hand with confidence, fully persuaded that it has been the best guardian of the interests of the whole country and the rights of all the people, they cannot and will not fail to trust it in the future.

The issues upon which the people are called to decide in this campaign were largely made by the Republican party in the session of Congress just closed. The Republicans in the Fifty-first Congress proposed and passed laws that will prove more beneficial in their results and far-reaching in their effects on the prosperity of the country than those passed by any Congress since the war.

The Republican party has already made the Fifty-first Congress illustrious and glorious in our national history. To the industrious, painstaking, courageous and patriotic Republican leaders who shaped the policy and brought forward the measures that have become laws and others that will be passed at the next session of Congress, the country owes a debt of gratitude that it can scarcely pay.

THE SILVER BILL

Among the important bills passed the Silver bill was the first. It was purely a Republican measure. In many respects it is one of the most important laws ever passed by Congress. It not only encourages a large and important home industry, but it gives the country more money at a time when the people sorely need it. More money is needed to do the business of the country. This act will add in ten years more than six hundred millions of dollars to the money circulation of the country. This will not only help the whole country, but aid the farmers and the debtor classes. France, safe and conservative in monetary affairs, with only about one-half of our population, transacting one-third of the business we transact, has nearly twice as much money as the United States. In France panics and financial depressions are almost unknown. Since the Silver law went into effect the silver dollar has increased in value about twenty cents, making the three hundred and seventy millions of silver bullion which we have worth about seventy millions more than before. Since then the wheat crop has advanced in value one hundred and forty millions, the corn crop about four hundred millions, and the oats crop about one hundred and fifty millions of dollars, and the value of other products in proportion. Every vote cast against this bill was Democratic and every vote for it was Republican, and this is the record the Democratic party made on this great measure.

THE M'KINLEY BILL.

The McKinley bill, now a law, was also a Republican measure. It will rank in importance and in its beneficial effects upon the country and its industries next, if not equal to, the Morrill Tariff Bill. It embodies the doctrine of the

tariff and protection to American industries as understood and interpreted by the Republican party. It adheres to the principles laid down by Washington, Madison, and the founders of the government. It aims to protect home industries and home interests by laying a tax or duty on all foreign products brought to this country to be sold in competition with American products, and admitting free of tax all non-competing articles brought here from other countries which cannot be successfully produced in the United States.

It would be impossible to frame a tariff bill so perfect that it would be free from all objection, or that would suit all interests. Taken all in all, however, the law just passed is a wise measure framed in the interest of the whole people, American industries and home markets, all of which it will foster, promote and protect, while supplying the necessary revenues to the government. Under this law, almost for the first time in the history of the country, the farmer has received direct protection. The taxes or duties on farm products coming from other countries have been largely increased. The new law places a protective duty on all animals, vegetables, barley, hemp, flax, and all other products of the soil. Beans, eggs, wool and many other articles placed on the free list by the Democratic Mills Bill, have been taxed, and in most cases the duties under the old law have been increased.

The following shows the increase made under the new law over the old law and the Mills Bill:

RATES OF DUTY ON FOREIGN PRODUCTS.

Article.	Present Law.	Democratic Mills Bill.	Republican Tariff of 1890.
Barley,	10c. per bushel.	10c. per bushel.	30c. per bushel.
Buckwheat,	10 per cent.	10c. per bushel.	15c. per bushel.
Corn,	10c. per bushel.	10c. per bushel.	15c. per bushel.
Oats,	10c. per bushel.	10c. per bushel.	15c. per bushel.
Wheat,	20c. per bushel.	20c. per bushel.	25c. per bushel.
Butter,	4c. per pound.	4c. per pound.	6c. per pound.
Cheese,	4c. per pound.	4c. per pound.	6c. per pound.
Beans,	10 per cent.	Free.	40c. per bushel.
Eggs,	Free.	Free.	5c. per dozen.
Hay,	\$2 per ton.	\$2 per ton.	\$4 per ton.
Hops,	8c. per pound.	8c. per pound.	15c. per pound.
Potatoes,	15c. per bushel.	15c. per bushel.	25c. per bushel.
Flaxseed, etc.,	20c. per bushel.	20c. per bushel.	30c. per bushel.
Garden seed,	20 per cent.	Free.	20 per cent.
Bacon and Hams,	2c. per pound.	2c. per pound.	5c. per pound.
Beef, mutton, etc.,	1c. per pound.	1c. per pound.	2c. per pound.
Wool, first-class,	10c. per pound.	Free.	11c. per pound.
Wool, second-class,	12c. per pound.	Free.	12c. per pound.
Wool, third-class,	2½c. per pound.	Free.	32c. per pound.
Wool, third-class,	5c. per pound.	Free.	50 per cent.
Leaf tobacco, stemmed,	\$1 per pound.	\$1 per pound.	\$2.75 per pound.
Leaf, not stemmed,	75c. per pound.	75c. per pound.	\$2.00 per pound.
All other, stemmed,	40c. per pound.	40c. per pound.	50c. per pound.
Flax,	\$20 per ton.	Free.	1c. per pound.
Plums and prunes,	1c. per pound.	Free.	2c. per pound.

Last year we imported farm products of the value of sixty-five millions of dollars. We paid this enormous sum to foreign farmers when we should

have kept it at home. Though the richest farming country in the world, we paid to other countries more than three millions of dollars for horses, sheep and cattle; more than seven millions for barley; more than two millions for eggs.

Under the law just passed the farmers have not only secured protection and been largely relieved from competition, but owing to the establishment of our manufacturing industries under protection and home competition, they are enabled to buy farming implements and tools cheaper than they can be bought in any other country in the world. In addition to all this, under the law the farmers will be indirectly benefited by the better protection given to the manufacturing industries; because as new plants are established and old ones increased and enlarged, more men must be employed and fed, which will increase the consumption of food products, and the demand and the price for the same.

The McKinley bill reduces taxation about sixty millions. It places on the free list imports which last year were valued, duty paid, at one hundred and seventy-seven millions. The Mills-Grover-Cleveland-Democratic Combination bill transferred to the free list much less than this amount. It is estimated that hereafter, under the McKinley Bill, fifty per cent. of all the goods we import will be free of tax or duty.

Under the internal revenue reduction brought about by the McKinley Bill, six hundred thousand persons will be relieved from paying taxes. The McKinley Bill also provides under proper restrictions for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with South American countries, which promises to extend our markets.

REDUCTION OF TAXATION BY THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES.

Since 1876, the Democratic party has had control of the House twelve years. Four years of this time it has had the President and two years' control of the Senate. During that time it has had the amplest opportunity to correct the evils of which it constantly complained, especially in the matter of reducing taxation. What has been the result? During this time it has never revised the tariff, and reduced the revenue only seven millions of dollars. The Republican party, since 1876, has had control of the House eleven years, and during this time, without making any special boast, has gone forward and reduced taxation three hundred millions of dollars, and the new tariff law will add to this sum sixty millions more.

TIN PLATE INDUSTRY.

The Democratic party has persistently opposed protecting the tin plate industry of this country. At the last session of Congress the Republicans put tin on the free list and advanced the duty on tin plate, so that this industry may be established and built up in the United States. It must be kept in mind that what we call tin plate is made largely of steel or iron. No well-founded argument can be made against the encouragement of this industry. We produce everything to make tin plate that England does, except the tin; then why should we not admit tin free and manufacture the tin plate for our own people? To-day the United States consumes more tin plate than all the rest of the world. In the last twenty-five years we have bought directly for manufacturing purposes four million tons, or eight billion pounds of tin plate, for which there has been paid, outside of duty and freight, over three hundred millions of dollars, when it could have been made in this country, three hundred million dollars saved, and thirty-five thousand people given employment whose annual wages would have been twenty-four million dollars.

We consumed last year three hundred thousand tons of tin plate, on which we paid a duty of about seven million dollars. The United States now pays thirty-three million dollars a year for tin plate. If we could manufacture two hundred and fifty thousand tons of tin plate, it is estimated we would consume in doing so about eight hundred and fifty thousand tons of iron ore, three hundred thousand tons of limestone, one million five hundred thousand tons of coal and coke, three hundred thousand tons of pig iron, five million pounds of lead, twenty-five million pounds of sulphuric acid, eleven million feet of lumber and twenty-five million pounds of tin. Every article named, except tin and lead, can be produced in West Virginia. The number of people necessarily employed in all the operations of tin plate making, and those dependent upon them, would amount to three hundred thousand. These three hundred thousand people, allowing they consume only twenty-five cents a day (which is too low an estimate), would make their consumption for food, clothing and shelter amount to twenty-eight million dollars per year. In 1873 forty-five attempts were made to establish the tin plate industry in this country, but the English producers, under a trust, reduced the price from \$12 to \$4.50 a box so as to crush it out here, and they succeeded. The establishment of this industry in the United States will not only provide labor for the wage earners, but will largely increase the consumption of raw materials and farm products, by creating a larger demand for the same, and in the end thus benefit the whole country. Once established, the price of tin plate, though it may be high at first like steel rails, wire nails, bar iron and many other protected products, under home competition will be gradually reduced, until it can be bought cheaper than the price we now pay England. Strange to say, in the face of this showing, the Democratic member of Congress from the Second district, Mr. Wilson, has uniformly opposed this industry. He attacked it in his speeches in Barbour county and at Harman, and in doing so he opposed the finding of increased markets for most all the products of his own State.

SHIPPING INTERESTS.

At the last session of Congress the Republican party brought in two bills to encourage shipping. It is admitted on all sides that this interest needs encouragement. Before the war the United States had about 70 per cent. of international trade which was carried in American ships; now they have only 14 per cent. Our people have been frightened by the word "Subsidy," while England has gone on subsidizing. It is largely through her encouragement to shipping that England is able to control the commerce of Asia, the East Indies, and South and Central America, which we are now trying to win from her. Our exports and imports for the year 1889 amounted to nearly 20,000,000 tons, on which we paid freight to the amount of about \$200,000,000, of which the people of the United States received about 14 per cent., the foreign ship owners the rest, or about \$169,000,000.

We have in our trade about fifty steamers, representing a capital of \$15,000,000, while England has a merchant marine amounting to about 5,000 vessels, ninety-six of which are steam vessels, in all representing a capital of \$1,100,000,000. The United States pays about \$100,000 a year for carrying foreign mails, while England gives in the way of postal subsidies and bounties nearly \$4,000,000 a year. The United States pays vast sums to the railroads for carrying the mails, but nothing comparatively to ocean steamers. Five million dollars are paid annually to the stages for carrying mails in this country; a stage receives 6 cents per mile, while an ocean steamer receives 2 cents. A steamer on Chesapeake Bay receives \$50,000 for carrying the mails, which is more than all the Central and South American lines receive. There was paid last year more than \$80,000 to carry the mails on the rivers of Florida, which

was \$30,000 more than was paid for the entire service to Central America. One of the safest and surest ways in which to secure the trade of South America, and to dispute with England for commercial supremacy in India and the East, is to establish lines of ocean steamers to South America and other parts of the world. The amount paid for carrying mails to Spanish America was : In 1850, \$514,000 ; 1860, \$707,244 ; 1870, \$799,388 ; 1880, \$38,779 ; 1888, \$48,966. In 1888 the total cost of our mail service was \$55,795,000, of which we paid \$48,966 for carrying mails to Spanish America.

In 1888 the United States paid the steamships for carrying mails \$481,000, of which \$81,000 was paid to our own vessels sailing under the American flag, and \$400,000 went to English and other ships. The United States, with its trade and commerce, and its enormous coast, washed by two oceans, ought to be the leading maritime power of the world, and do most of the shipping and carry most of the commerce of the world. If the bills that have passed the Senate become laws, they would save to the people of the United States one hundred and fifty millions annually now paid to other countries for carrying freight. Ship-yards would spring up on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts which would employ from 50,000 to 100,000 men, and furnish a market for steel, iron, wood, coal, coke and other products.

England employs 120,000 men in building ships and 50,000 in sailing them. Whenever the United States shall expend from her treasury four or five millions annually to aid her steamship lines, as England and France do, then will our ships sail on every sea, and visit every port in the world.

HOME MARKETS.

Americans consume more than any other people on the globe ; they are better fed, better clothed and better sheltered. It costs more to keep an American than a person of any other nationality, and therefore an American needs and should receive more.

In the United States it is estimated that each inhabitant consumes annually about forty bushels of grain, while in great Britain each inhabitant consumes twenty bushels, and in Italy ten bushels. In the United States about 120 pounds of meat are consumed per year by each inhabitant ; in Great Britain 105 pounds ; in France 74 pounds ; in Germany 69 pounds, and in Italy 23 pounds. The average for all Europe being 63½ pounds.

The world produces about 5,000,000 tons of sugar, of which the United States consumes about 1,500,000 tons, or nearly thirty per cent. There are 850,000 tons of coffee produced in the world, of which the United States takes 260,000 tons, or about thirty per cent. There are produced about 25,000,000 tons of iron in the world, of which the United States consumes over 8,000,000 tons, or about one-third. Of the 10,000,000 tons of steel produced in the world, the United States uses about one-third. Of the lead production of the world the United States consumes about thirty per cent. Of the 11,500,000 bales of cotton produced in the world, the United States uses and consumes 2,600,000, about one-fourth. The United States consumes six hundred million tons of wool, which is about one-third of the production of the world ; it uses about one-third of the India rubber produced in the world ; more than half of the tin, and nearly forty per cent. of all the coal produced in the mines of the world. In a word, the United States consumes from twenty-five to thirty per cent. of the leading products of the world. It is estimated that the trade of Chicago and Philadelphia aggregates more than that of all South America and Canada ; and that of New York, Chicago and Philadelphia, more than the trade of South America, Canada and Mexico. What we sell abroad is infinitesimal compared to what we sell at home. According to the Bureau of Statistics, in 1880, the productions of the United States were worth ten thousand

millions of dollars, 91½ per cent. of which was consumed at home, and 8½ per cent. was sent abroad.

To get things cheaper we are asked to allow Europe to share in this magnificent-home market, the best in the world, by removing the tax against the European producer, and putting him on an equality with the American producer. As the cost of everything we consume is about ninety-five per cent. for labor, this equality cannot come about except by forcing down the prices of American labor to a level of prices paid in England, France, Belgium, Italy, Russia and India, all our competitors in the markets of the world. If we remove the tax one of two things must happen—Our people must work for the same wages that the European wage-earner does, so we can compete on our own ground, or we must close most of our mills, factories, furnaces and industrial plants, millions of people would thus be thrown out of employment, and disaster and financial ruin would follow.

What would be the situation if the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were only a mile wide? On one side, only a mile away, we would have, according to a good free trade writer, the following wages paid to ordinary mechanics: Great Britain, per day, 91 cents; France, per day, 80 cents; Germany, per day, 72 cents; Italy, per day, 65 cents; Russia, per day, 35 cents.

On the other side, only a mile distant, we would have staring us in the face the following wages paid to the same class of laborers; China, per day, 20 cents; India, per day, 15 cents. The moment we removed the onerous tax of which our Democratic friends complain, we would be flooded with products of these countries until our people consented to work for the same wages. With the great improvements making in steamships, the Atlantic and Pacific oceans are not as wide for purposes of commerce as they were a hundred years ago.

The Republican party will never consent that the wages of the American people be forced down to meet those of England and the East, so that there can be free trade and cheap products. There is too much liberty, too much humanity and too much manhood abroad in this free land ever to submit to this. It cost rivers of blood to reach the present point in our civilization; it will cost oceans of blood to even try to turn backward the tide. The people control this country; they will never make laws to put themselves and their families back into the black midnight of barbarism and the dark ages.

PROGRESS OF THE SOUTH SINCE 1880.

The prosperity of the South furnishes an unanswerable argument in favor of protection and an answer to free trade notions and theories. Under protection no part of the country has made more substantial progress than the South. Overwhelmed with disaster a quarter of a century ago, ruined in fortune, defeated and discouraged, sitting in the ashes of despair—no part of the country has made more progress than the South; money has accumulated, rates of interest not only have everywhere decreased, but vast amounts of capital have gone into railroads, mines, furnaces and factories. Iron and steel industries have been established in Alabama and Tennessee, adding millions and millions of dollars to their industries and furnishing a home market to farmers for their products. In Georgia cotton and other mills have been established; railroads have been built. The assessed value of real and personal property has more than doubled in Alabama, Arkansas and Florida, nearly doubled in Kentucky and Louisiana, in Mississippi increased fifty millions; in North Carolina seven million dollars; in South Carolina fifteen millions; in Tennessee more than one hundred millions; more than doubled in Texas, and increased ninety millions in Virginia, showing an aggregate growth in the wealth of these States in ten years from two billion to three billion six hundred million dollars.

Southern debts have decreased in the aggregate from two hundred millions to one hundred and seventy millions. The railroad mileage has increased from 17,800 to 38,000 miles, and there are now 2,500 miles in process of construction. In the last ten years there have been built nearly one hundred cotton mills, and the number of spindles quadrupled. Pig iron is produced for from \$9 to \$12 per ton, while in the North it costs from \$12 to \$20. The production of pig iron has grown from three hundred and fifteen thousand to one million seven hundred thousand tons; the lumber production from forty-seven million feet to one hundred and ten million feet. Manufacturing and mining have made progress on a larger scale than ever before known. The cotton crop last year brought her farmers more than four hundred million dollars. The aggregate value of all Southern production in 1890 is about two billion dollars, or an increase of eight hundred millions since 1880. Eight thousand millions have gone to the South since 1865 for cotton. But for protection the iron furnaces springing up in the South, and especially in Virginia and Alabama, could not exist. If iron and steel were admitted free, because they can be bought cheaper from England, the iron industries of the South would cease.

CONDITION AND PROGRESS OF THE COUNTRY—AN ARGUMENT FOR PROTECTION.

The greatest argument, however, in favor of protection and its proudest monument is the present condition of the country and the progress it has made under thirty years of uninterrupted protection. The United States, during the last fifty years, and more especially the last thirty years, has enjoyed a degree of prosperity, progress and development that has not been equaled in the history of all civilization. During this time railroads have increased from three to one hundred and seventy thousands of miles. Eleven thousand millions of dollars are now invested in agriculture. The people own between four and five million farms. The land under cultivation now amounts to three hundred million acres. Within the last thirty years the corn production has increased from five hundred to two thousand million, and wheat from one hundred to five hundred million bushels. The oat crop reached in 1889 seven hundred and fifty million bushels. The cotton crop amounted to seven million bales. In thirty years we have received from other countries and given homes, employment and occupation to over eleven million of immigrants. The United States stands the greatest agricultural country in the world, or that ever was, producing thirty per cent. of the food of the world and fixing the price of food products in the best markets of the world. Railroad rates in twenty years have been reduced fifty per cent. We have twenty-two States with more than a million of population, and three cities with more than a million each, while Europe, with more than a thousand years of civilization and progress, can boast of only three cities with over a million. In the last decade one city of the Union has increased over 118 per cent. in population. In the last ten years, under protection, State debts have decreased about sixty million dollars, and the United States has reduced its debt about one thousand million of dollars, while the debts of European countries have been constantly increasing. Under thirty years of protection the United States has been able not only to build up and establish vast manufacturing industries, so that our people can now compete, in selling many manufactured articles, with European countries, but during this time there has been a gradual reduction in the price of articles to her own citizens. Manufacturing establishments have increased until they now number three hundred thousand. Our exports were never so great as they are to-day. The working people of the United States have now on deposit in saving institutions and building associations about six thousand millions of dollars; and this is more than the savings of all the wage-earners of Europe. Our operatives deposit seven dollars to the English operatives' one dollar. On a

basis of sixty-five millions of population, the public debt per capita of the United States is about twenty-five dollars. This is less than any other of the leading nations of the world.

Between 1870 and 1880, England, under free trade, increased her rate of taxation over twenty-four per cent. The United States, under protection, diminished nearly ten per cent. It is estimated that fifty millions of English money was invested last year in our protected manufacturing plants. No American money has been invested in the free trade plants of England. From 1876 to 1890, inclusive, our exports have exceeded our imports more than one thousand five hundred millions. The Republican party claims that all these magnificent results are due largely to the fostering care of protection to American industries. If, however, this claim should not be well founded, can it be possible that a country could prosper as this country has prospered, under twenty-nine years of protection, if the people are oppressed with the burdens of taxation, and protection is a system of robbery to build up one interest against another? If the tariff is nothing more nor less than robbery, as claimed by the Democratic party, and is oppressive, onerous and exacting, how can the progress of the country be reconciled with high protection?

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS NO FIXED POLICY ON TAXATION.

The Democratic party since 1860 has lost the power to govern, and has proven itself to be without the faculty of administration. It has no fixed policy, no correct methods; it lives on obstruction and opposition to the Republican party in its attempts to secure needed legislation. *At long intervals it is sometimes right on the principle that the clock that never goes speaks correctly twice a day.* While their leaders in Congress and out of Congress have constantly declared that the tariff should be for revenue only, and this has been incorporated in their platforms, yet in all debates in the House and Senate, wherever any particular State had an interest that should be protected, and it was proposed to take the duty off of such protected articles, Democratic members and Senators have been found to be the loudest for protection. Maryland Democrats in Congress have always favored the protection of coal, and the West Virginia Senators the same, this being the most important production of these two states. The North and South Carolina delegations in Congress have resisted reduction of duties on rice; the Texas members on hides; the Missouri delegation on zinc and lead. And this has been the case in every Democratic State of the Union where there has been a special interest to be favored or protected.

THEORY OF PROTECTION.

The Republican party claims that all articles manufactured in the United States in competition with like articles produced in European and other countries, should be protected by charging the foreign producer a tax to sell his products in this country, to the extent at least of the difference in wages, or the difference in the cost of production, because the foreign producer could, if there were no license or tax imposed upon him, sell his products in the United States cheaper than our own people. The Republican party also claims that home competition under protection is the surest means, not only of establishing our manufacturing industries, but in the long run the safest to reduce the price of manufactured articles. In the United States there are now 300,000 manufacturing establishments, all in competition. They employ more than five millions of people, who receive in wages two thousand millions annually, and produce about 8,000 millions of commodities. The result is now and has been, under this competition, that prices have been greatly reduced. This is all the competition we want or can stand. If there were no protection we

could not stand foreign competition. Home competition and home consumption tend to a gradual but healthful reduction of prices of products, while foreign competition is destructive of both the prices of labor and American products. Free trade would destroy or greatly impair our manufacturing interests and home markets, while the prices of articles admitted free would remain the same or increase. Protection, instead of being a tax or burden as claimed by the Democratic party, not only enables us to build up our home manufactories, increase home consumption and thereby home markets, but in the long run, through home competition, the prices of manufactured products are reduced. Free trade never could accomplish these results.

Free trade might enable us to compete in the world's markets in agricultural products, but we would have to reduce the price in order to compete with the cheap labor of India, Egypt and Russia. In doing this we would largely raise the price of the manufactured products that we bought abroad. Free trade would make the farmer of the United States compete with the farmers of Europe, many of whom are now his present customers. With proper protection and home competition, we can so firmly establish our manufacturing industries, and reduce the price of manufactured articles, that we can in time compete successfully with Europe in the markets of the world. When this time arrives, we may declare for free trade, as England did, and it may be to our interest to do so. We want no free trade that does not come logically through protection, and we surely do not want it until we can compete successfully in the markets of the world with other countries; and if that time never comes, the United States will never want free trade.

WE WANT AN AMERICAN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Political economy, although claimed to be by writers on this subject, is not an exact science. The rules governing trade and commerce that suit one country are often not suited to another. England teaches a free trade political economy, and this suits England and English interests. English economic writers proclaim it a science suited to all the world and all times, because it suits the interests of England. Many of our professors, especially those in New England colleges and generally the leaders of the Democracy, adopt these English notions of political economy and insist that they should obtain in the United States. They are good for England, but bad for us. The United States, a world within itself, and sufficient unto itself for all purposes, needs a political economy of another sort. Our surroundings and conditions are all different from those of European and other countries. The United States requires a political economy suited to its conditions and surroundings and based on the protection of American interests. It might be similar to that of England in one respect—elastic. England's elastic political free trade economy has never prevented England from protecting her best and largest interests whenever it suited her to do so, especially her shipping interests.

RESULTS OF PROTECTION.

Experience and statistics show in the United States that American manufactured articles under protection have constantly in the aggregate been reduced in price, while articles on the free list have, for the most part, as to price, remained the same, and in many instances advanced. This, to my mind, is the best possible answer to all free trade notions and ideas. Thirty years ago we did not manufacture steel rails, and when we began and the duty on steel rails was made \$28 a ton, they were selling at \$160 a ton. Since then, not only has the price been reduced from \$160 to \$30 per ton, but we have successfully established steel rail plants throughout the country. No one can be found who

would believe that if we had not protected the steel rail industry the price would have been reduced to what it is at present. Take the case of wire nails. Up to 1883 they were not manufactured in this country to any extent, and they sold for \$6 a keg. In that year a protective duty was placed on wire nails, and last year, in the short space of seven years, the American product reached two million five hundred thousand kegs, and they have sold as low as \$2.15 per keg. In the case of wool, in 1860, after fourteen years of non-protective tariff, or tariff for revenue only—Democratic tariff—we produced sixty million pounds of wool, or 17-10 pounds per capita. In 1884, after twenty-four years of protective tariff, the product was three hundred and eight million pounds, or about six pounds per capita. Then followed the reduction of duty on wool; the result was our home production fell off and importations increased. The McKinley bill restores the protective duty of 1883, and it is estimated that this will not only greatly increase the home production, but give employment to one hundred and fifty thousand men in the United States. Like instances might be multiplied.

A comparison of prices in 1870 and in 1880 will show that nearly every manufactured article that the farmer, mechanic and wage-earners have to buy was on an average from 25 to 30 per cent. cheaper in 1880 than 1870. Statistics will also show that since 1870 farm products and price of labor have advanced. Never in the history of this country would a day's labor buy as many comforts as to-day.

Fifty years ago, before our manufacturing interests were established—there are men now living who worked in the harvest field from sun up until sun down, and sometimes from starlight to starlight, for fifty cents a day and found themselves—corn sold for from 15 to 20 cents per bushel, wheat from 25 to 30 cents, and pork \$1 per hundred pounds. Good cows could be bought for from \$5 to \$8, and good horses from \$30 to \$50. In those days calico sold for 25 to 30 cents per yard. It took eight yards to make a dress. Under protection the same calico can now be bought for five cents per yard. It took a man four to five days to earn enough money to buy his wife a dress; now a day laborer can earn enough to buy his wife three dresses. It took then ten to twenty bushels of corn, ten to fifteen bushels of wheat and two hundred pounds of pork to buy the same calico dress; now these products of the farmer will buy a dozen calico dresses.

By the establishment of manufacturing industries through protection, the United States has been able to produce largely what it consumes and reduce the price of what it buys abroad, besides furnishing employment to our own people, increasing home consumption and keeping the money at home which, if these manufacturing industries had not been established, would have been sent abroad to pay for imported goods. Had we continued to buy steel rails, wire nails, woolen goods and other manufactured articles from European countries, we never could have established our manufacturing industries, and we would have impoverished and bankrupted the country in trying to pay for the goods we bought abroad.

OUR FATHERS FOUGHT FOR INDUSTRIAL AS WELL AS POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE.

Our fathers fought for industrial as well as political independence. They wanted to manage, control and build up their industries in their own way. It is a historic fact that England wanted the colonies to take her manufactured goods and they resisted. Although the Government was started on the basis of protection to manufacturing interests, yet it came about early in our history that the South dominated public sentiment and dictated the policy of the Government. The South believed that with slave labor and cotton growing its people would be more prosperous in pursuing agriculture than manu-

facturing. It is at this point in the history of our legislation that we begin to detect free trade tendencies, and this continued more or less until the war. The South believed so strongly in free trade in 1860, that in making the Confederate Constitution, it declared against protection in terms. As events have proven the South was mistaken, her chief glory and greatest source of wealth will yet come through her manufacturing interests.

One of the assertions constantly made by the tariff reformers is that the Republican party maintains and even increases war taxes, and points to the increased percentage of tax or the ad valorem duty being as high, if not higher, than during the war. They forget that as the percentage advances the price of the article is reduced. When steel rails were \$100 per ton the duty was \$28 per ton or 28 per cent. of the value of the rails. As the price of rails declined and the duty remained, of course the percentage increased. When rails went down to \$50, the percentage doubled or was 56 per cent., and so with other articles. This answers the high or war tax argument. We pass laws preventing foreign contract labor from coming into this country—why not prevent by legislation the cheap products of this labor? Whenever the conditions are the same all over the world, and especially the price of labor or wages is the same, and the cost of living the same, then we can afford free trade. We cannot afford it in justice to our people so long as the wage-earners of Europe consume less and work for less than the American wage-earners. Germany, France, Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary, the leading nations of Europe, are all adopting a protective tariff—they have tried free trade long enough. In the face of this fact the Democratic party is daily growing bolder in its demand for free trade.

PRODUCTS BROUGHT FROM EUROPE SHOULD BE MADE HERE.

Last year we imported and paid for about four hundred millions of dollars' worth of foreign products, on which a duty was paid. Think of this vast sum, and then think of the Democratic party wanting the tax against the foreigner reduced so he could bring in thousands of million dollars. Nearly every article we bought from other countries, and for which we paid four hundred millions, could have been made in this country and employment given to our own people instead of to foreigners.

The very fewest manufacturers in the country have accumulated vast fortunes. Statistics show there is a larger percentage of failures in attempts to successfully establish and carry on manufacturing interests than in most any other class of business. Manufacturing is hazardous. It requires large capital, sound business judgment and economy to be successful. The great fortunes in this country have not been made in manufacturing, but in railroads, oil, gold and silver mining, speculation and real estate, with which protection had nothing to do except indirectly. Not a dollar of the colossal fortunes of the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, Rockafellers, or the Astors came directly from protection or manufacturing. The fortune of Mr. Andrew Carnegie—and it is the most conspicuous example—was not all made in manufacturing, and it is the only case in which a very large fortune has been accumulated on the part of a manufacturer. The fortunes made in the railroad world, in mines and mining, real estate and oil production are a hundred times more numerous than those made in manufactures, and many times larger.

If half the factories and mills in the country should be destroyed or shut down for any reason, general disaster would overtake the country. The injury to the farmer would be direct and widespread; hundreds of thousands of people would have to seek agriculture as a means of support and become competitors of the farmers; besides half of the present market would be taken from the

farmer. Free trade or a tariff for revenue only would close a large number of our industrial plants.

WEST VIRGINIA A PROTECTION STATE.

If any State in the Union is irreversibly and irrevocably a protection State, and must depend upon protection, it is West Virginia. West Virginia depends almost entirely for her progress and prosperity upon her large quantities of coal, iron ore, timber and salt. Under protection she produced last year more than five million tons of coal, ranking the first coal-producing State in the South and the third in the whole Union. If the products of West Virginia were not protected, but thrown open to foreign competition, her railroad development would stop, lumber mills close and coal and iron mines shut down. If free trade should obtain, or the Democratic theory of tariff for revenue only prevails, as contended for by our Democratic representatives in Congress, the progress of West Virginia would be retarded and the development of her vast natural resources set back a century and her people become impoverished and bankrupt. Coal and iron would lie dormant in her mines and the timber in her forests stand untouched.

The progress and prosperity of West Virginia in the future depend largely upon her becoming a manufacturing State. Wherever you go in West Virginia the cry is for more coal and iron mines to be opened, more manufacturing plants, iron furnaces, coke ovens, lumber and woolen mills, tanneries and paper factories, and there is not a town in the State but wants to encourage these industries,—and most of them have the material at hand to establish them if capital could be found. Suited as well as any State in the Union and more than most of them to manufacturing of all kinds, West Virginia needs more capital invested within her borders, more men with money to come among her people. In a word she needs scattered all over the sides of her beautiful mountains and through her fertile valleys more manufactories and more industrial plants. How best to get capital and these desirable things, is the question. We are now at the crucial point in the argument. As Thomas H. Benton often said, "the knife is on the nerve." And just here begins our difference as citizens of West Virginia with the Democratic party, and more particularly our cause of complaint against our Democratic Senators and Congressman Wilson. Can West Virginia get all these things through free trade? Without argument I say, no, never. Can she best get them or at all through a constant war on protection, the manufacturers of the country and manufacturing interests? A state and the temper of the people is often judged by the official utterances of its chosen representatives. Capital is timid, manufacturers—the people we need most—seek investments only where they are welcome, sure of protection and partial immunity at least from unwise legislation. Read the speeches of our Senators and Democratic member of Congress; their violent attacks even in Congress on protection and manufacturing interests, and then answer whether capital, manufacturers and factory builders are authorized to believe they would be welcome to West Virginia. I quote briefly from some of their recent speeches.

UTTERANCES OF WEST VIRGINIA DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION AGAINST PROTECTION AND MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. Wilson, in his Barbour county speech, in speaking of the duty on tinplate, calls it "unjust taxation." In another place, speaking of the increased tax on wool in the McKinley bill, he says it is "unjust and merciless." Further on he says, "it is not in the blood of this people to rest quietly when they know that an unjust tax is daily and hourly robbing them and their wives and

their children." In speaking of protection, he calls it "an iniquitous system, and it will not be many years until the people sweep it out of existence."

In a speech in the Senate, September 1, on the pending tariff bill, Senator Kenna uses this language: "That the enormous largesses levied upon our people were made possible by the consequences of war and have been made profitable by the manufacturers, who have been thereby enabled to maintain the prices of war in time of peace. That our surplus cereals are to rot in their barns, and our farmers to starve to enable our surplus manufacturers to find a profitable market in foreign countries." "That the system which this bill is intended to perpetuate has given half of the wealth of the country to three hundred men, and is reducing the masses of the people to vassalage and to bondage."

Senator Faulkner, in his speech made in the Senate in August, in speaking of the Republican party and manufacturers, uses this language: "It deliberately entered into a partnership with the representatives of the manufacturing interests to defeat the purity of the ballot, to reverse the honest sentiment of a majority of the people * * to disgrace a government." In another place he uses this language: "The arrogant demand of the capitalist, the manufacturer and monopolist * * has been considered and favorably answered." In another place he styles the manufacturing industry of the country "the pampered favorite of class legislation." In addition to all this the junior Senator, not satisfied in his hot zeal to destroy protection, makes an argument to show that it is not constitutional. He is sworn to support the Constitution—if he believes in his argument, how can he consistently vote for protection by voting to put a tax on foreign coal? But I leave this ardent young Senator's constitutional argument to be answered by Washington, Madison and other fathers of the country and Constitution makers.

On the Fourth of July, 1789, George Washington, as President, approved the second act ever passed by Congress. It was introduced by James Madison, and contains this recital: "Whereas, It is necessary for the support of the government, for the discharge of debts of the United States, *and the encouragement and protection of manufactures*, that duties be laid on goods, wares and merchandise imported."

The people of West Virginia are called upon to rebuke the intemperate and extravagant language and the lurid rhetoric of its Democratic representatives in Congress, in their opposition to protection and the manufacturing interests of the country. These violent attacks on protection, which has made West Virginia what it is, and which promises to make it among the first and most prosperous States of the Union, should not be passed unnoticed. The people should protest against this anti-Americanism and this Anglo-mania, and set the seal of condemnation on such reckless statements. If protection is burdensome, oppressive, and the robbery that the Democratic delegation in Congress claims it to be, why have they not the manhood to follow to its legitimate conclusion the doctrine they preach in their crusade against manufacturing interests, and vote for coal to be admitted free? Like Democratic representatives from other States, they vote to protect the special interest of their State, and yet condemn the policy of protection, and not always in the most parliamentary language. To be logical, the Democratic representatives from West Virginia should vote for free coal, free wool (as they did), free lumber and free salt. It is not fair to preach free trade and tariff for revenue as the only means of safety for this Republic, and vote to protect coal. If West Virginia persists in sending such representatives to Congress, the time is not far distant when the protection representatives from other States will grow impatient and unwilling to maintain the duties on the products of West Virginia while their representatives are doing all they can in Congress and out to break down pro-

tection. To send such representatives to Congress to make laws for a protection State like West Virginia, is like unto sending an infidel to church to say his prayers, or into a convention of churchmen to frame a prayer book. The presence of these gentlemen in Congress from West Virginia is a solecism in American politics.

The Republicans of West Virginia are willing to throw wide open the doors of the State to capital, and write across them in flaming letters, welcome, and welcome again. Nor are Republicans afraid of millionaires, even if our Democratic friends are. We say to them, come on, you, too, are welcome with your wealth. Against it we will put our coal and iron mines, our forests of timber and other natural resources, and together helping each other we will move forward in the development of this fair, young Commonwealth until within all its borders it is filled with prosperous homes and a happy people.

HON. W. L. WILSON'S CHECKERED RECORD.

In 1886 the Oleomargarine bill was passed. It was intended to protect from fraud the makers of butter. Mr. Wilson voted against it on the final passage of the bill, and for all amendments intended to weaken it.

The Compound Lard bill was intended to protect from fraud the makers of lard—Mr. Wilson, though present and not paired when it passed the House, refused to vote.

In 1886 he voted against the free coinage of silver, and in 1890 voted for it. In 1890 he voted squarely against the Silver bill and the increased purchase of silver under it.

In August, 1890, Mr. Wilson voted against the original package law. This law, as all know, was intended to prevent the selling of packages of whiskey brought into a prohibition State, and was purely a temperance measure. In July, 1890, Mr. Wilson voted for an involuntary bankruptcy bill and against a voluntary one; that is, for a law forcing a man to become a bankrupt and against one allowing him to become one if he desired.

On May, 15, 1890, the following colloquy took place between Governor Dingley, of Maine, and Mr. Wilson on the subject of free coal:

Mr. Dingley—Will the gentleman pardon me for a question? I would like to know if the gentleman is in favor of putting coal, the crudest of all materials, on the free list?

Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia—I am in favor of putting any article on the free list along with a general bill reducing duties. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Dingley—Will the gentleman answer my question specifically?

Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia—When you come even to my position in your bill of reducing all along the line, I will consider that proposition.

Mr. Dingley—Now, will the gentlemen give me a specific answer to my question, because that will test the matter.

Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia—I will put coal or any thing else on the free list along with a bill making a compensating reduction of taxes upon those who use and produce it.

Mr. Dingley—But did the gentleman report coal on the free list when he made the reduction?

Mr. Wilson, of West Virginia—I was not the only framer of the bill. (Cries of "Ah!" on the Republican side.) I expressly apologized for that bill on the floor of this House by saying that it did not fulfill our full duty to the people, but that we had gone as far as we could at that time.

Mr. Dingley—Now, will the gentlemen inform me—

Mr. Wilson of West Virginia—Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not bring in any bill increasing duties on lime or anything else in my district. My district produces wool, and is a great lumber district.

Here was Mr. Wilson publicly challenged to say whether he would put on the free list the coal of his district and his State, and no persistency of questioning could induce him to make a direct reply. That which I have quoted from his record in Congress is in keeping with the record made by Mr. Wilson and the other West Virginia Democrats in Congress. They are against protection, except when a consistent free trade policy would deprive them of the last hope of holding their seats.

As West Virginians you owe it to your State to rebuke the conspiracy by which the brilliant leader of West Virginia Republicanism was cheated out of the honest result of an honest election, and the people defrauded out of their right to choose their own Governor. You should thunder it into the ballot box that the freemen of West Virginia will not submit to the control of a party which descends to grand larceny to hold itself in power. [Long continued applause.]

THE FOLLOWING PAMPHLETS,

— PUBLISHED BY —

THE FARMERS' PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Can be obtained, at the prices quoted, by addressing HON. JOHN H. LANDIS, Secretary, Windom, Lancaster County, Pa.

	PAGES.	PRICE PER 1000.
An Address to the Workingmen, at Proctor, Vt., by President Harrison,	4	\$1.50
A History of the Tariff, by Hon. James G. Blaine,	12	4.50
Reciprocity, by Hon. Eugene Hale,	16	6.00
Practical Effects of Protection, by Hon. S. B. Elkins,	16	6.00
Pauper Labor in Foreign Lands, by Hon. Wm. P. Frye,	8	3.00
A Tariff Lesson, by Hon. Wm. McKinley,	4	1.50
A Tariff for Revenue Only, by Hon. Nathan Goff,	4	1.50
What is a Protective Tariff? by McKinley, Grow, Morrell, Porter and others,	8	3.00
The Duty on Tin Plate, by McKinley and Burrows,	4	1.50
Speech before the Market Club, of Boston, by Hon. George F. Hoar, ..	8	3.00
Speech before the Market Club, of Boston, by Hon. Wm. McKinley, ..	8	3.00
Speech before the Market Club, of Boston, by Hon. Nelson W. Aldrich,	8	3.00
Speech before the Market Club, of Boston, by Hon. Thos. B. Reed, ..	4	1.50
A Century of Protection, by Hon. R. P. Porter,	32	12.00
A Comparison Between Free Trade in England and Protection in the United States, by Hon. Thos. H. Dudley,	8	3.00

A copy of each of the above pamphlets will be sent to any address upon receipt of 15 cents (postage stamps will be taken.)