

183.9400  
P/13252

TARIFF TAXES AND LABOR.

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. KENNA,  
OF WEST VIRGINIA,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

SEPTEMBER 2, 1890.

---

Like the noiseless creep of the tiger before he spring, slike the insidious ravage of disease before it racks the flesh and dims the eye, the citadel of human liberty is undermined before the call "to the tower" is heard. And so of extortion upon the earnings of the masses. The open demand for tribute that would encounter prompt rebuke at the hands of the multitude finds easy and successful substitution in the evasive process whereby its beneficiaries declare dividends of the earnings of labor and marshal their assets of its surrendered reward.

---

WASHINGTON.  
1890.



SPEECH  
OF  
HON. JOHN E. KENNA.

---

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes—

Mr. KENNA said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: Protection to American industries has been favored by the beneficiaries of that principle in one form or another since the foundation of the Government. But the power has been generally derived indirectly from the general power of taxation. Parties have been slow to assert, as their representatives have been slow to execute, a levy upon the earnings of the masses for the direct and avowed purpose of enriching and filling the coffers, not of the public Treasury, but of a selected and favored class. Fattened by the misfortunes of the country which made necessary the enormous exactions of war; adjusting the details of a system which has extracted billions from the earnings of the people to individual and corporate gain, the beneficiaries of that system have yet accomplished this result by the invocation of incidental powers.

No tariff bill has ever passed which was placed by its advocates upon the distinct and avowed ground that Congress had either inclination or power to levy tribute upon the community for the sole purpose of advancing the estate of its individual members.

Speaking of the complications of 1861, "the chief reliance of the United States for revenue," says Mr. Blaine, "had always been upon customs. But no real test had ever been made of the sum that might be collected from this source. The aim had been to see with how small an amount the National Government could be supported, not how large an amount might be collected." And so, Mr. President, from the beginning of the Government to the civil war, every enactment of tariff law had been subject to this limitation. No party favored taxing the people for the manufacturers only. No party dared face the public upon the proposition that the taxing power should be diverted from the fair limitations of public necessity to the limitless greed of private gain. From 1789 to 1861 the great battles were fought upon these floors, the great contests were waged by the advocates of one theory or another, and yet the public requirements, and not the individual profit, fixed the limitation of every demand.

No political platform ever ventured beyond this depth.

The Locofoco platform of 1836 declared that—

Every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of society, and this is all the law should enforce on him.

The Whig platform of 1844 declared—

For a tariff for revenue to defray the *necessary expenses* of the Government and discriminating with special reference to the protection of the domestic labor of the country.

The Whig platform of 1852 proclaimed that—

Governments should be conducted on the principles of the strictest economy, and revenue *sufficient for the expense* thereof in time of peace ought to be derived mainly from a duty on imports and not from direct taxes; and in laying such duties sound policy requires a just discrimination, and when practicable by specific duties, whereby suitable encouragement may be afforded to American industries, equally to all classes and to all portions of the country.

The Republican platform of 1860 declared that—

While providing revenue *for the support* of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of *these imports* as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.

The Republican platform of 1872 declared—

That *revenue*, except so much as may be derived from a tax upon tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor and promote the industry, prosperity, and growth of the whole country.

The Republican platform of 1876 declared that—

The revenue *necessary for current expenditures* and the *obligations of the public debt* must be largely derived from duties upon importations which so far as possible should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

The Republican platform of 1880 declared as follows:

We reaffirm the belief avowed in 1876 that the duties *levied for the purpose of revenue* should so discriminate as to favor American labor.

The Republican platform of 1884 declared:

We therefore demand that the imposition of duties upon foreign imports shall be made, not for revenue only, but that in raising the *requisite revenues for the Government* such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor, as well as capital, may have its just reward and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

The Republican platform of 1888 declared that—

The Republican party would effect all needed *reduction* of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and a burden to agriculture, and the tax upon the spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes, and by such revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from impost duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which can not be produced at home.

These, Mr. President, are the declarations, so far as I have been able to collect them, of the so-called protection platforms of the country. It will be observed that in every one, except the last, the declaration looks to the raising of revenue, and not one of them goes beyond the revenue standard in its theory of protection. In the last platform I have quoted, the Republican party, confronted by a large surplus in the Treasury under Cleveland's Administration, declared not for raising, but for reducing, the revenue by the exclusion of foreign competition.

Thus it will be seen that while no party ever advocated in Congress, and no party ever passed through Congress a tariff bill whose prime object was the advancement of private business at the expense of the public, it is equally true that from the foundation of the Government to this day no political party ever confronted the people of the country

upon a declaration of such a power or such a purpose. It was only when coupling the idea of revision with the avowed purpose of reducing the public revenue that the Republican party ventured to make the declaration of 1888, and it is only under the pretext of reduction that they undertake to carry it out.

And so, Mr. President, through all the stages from Madison down to McKinley, even from the protection standpoint, the idea of revenue has predominated in the enactments of the tariff. No matter when, no matter how, no matter by whom the measure was supported, until this day and generation the adjustment of the taxes of the country to the interests and purposes of classes and callings was limited by the reasonable and fair demands of the public Treasury. Never till now, and now only upon the pretext of reducing, and not of raising revenue, was an attempt made to revise the tariff system of the country for the sole and notorious purpose of advancing private and corporate wealth. The determination to do this at this time is a cause of alarm, and will arrest the attention of the country. I can not witness the close of the debate without a few observations which may go upon the record with what has been said.

Mr. President, the discussion of the pending bill, as far as it has progressed, has been able and exhaustive. It has demonstrated, among other things:

1. That the demands of a favored class and not the public necessities or the public good are the inspiration and purpose of this measure.
2. That the increase of the public burden by the raising of tariff duties is to be the actual, if not the acknowledged, effect of this bill.
3. That just in proportion to the exclusion of the foreign article which these increases of tariff duties will accomplish the American consumer will pay his taxes to the manufacturer and not to the Government.
4. That thus the public revenue is to be reduced, not by reducing the burdens of the people, but by compelling them to pay to the manufacturers, through the increased cost of the articles they consume, what they now pay through the retail and wholesale dealers and custom-houses to the Treasury of the country.
5. That this extraordinary scheme is for the protection chiefly of a single class of citizens of the nine States of the Union which own more wealth than the other thirty-three States and the Territories combined.
6. That this scheme will enable the American manufacturer to continue to sell, as he does now, his plows and reapers, and a thousand other articles, to Mexicans and South American Indians from 25 to 50 per cent. cheaper than he does to our own citizens.
7. That therefore, and to that extent this is a bill for the protection of Mexicans, Spaniards, half-breeds, and South American Indians, at the expense of the farmers, laborers, and consumers of the United States.
8. That the duty on hundreds of articles is largely in excess of the entire labor-cost of their production, and often multiplies it many-fold.
9. That protection to the product and *free competition in labor* reduces labor to the simple proposition of supply and demand, while it enhances the cost to the laborer and his family of the production of their own hands.
10. That the home market is to be reserved for the manufacturer, but the markets of the world shall supply his labor.

11. That we are to refuse to buy from anybody else and nobody else can therefore buy from us.

12. That our surplus cereals are to rot in their barns and our farmers to starve to enable our surplus manufactures to find profitable market in foreign countries with 50 per cent. off.

13. That the proposed reciprocity with South America is intended to establish a market *there* for our manufactures and a market *here* for South American products of the farm.

14. That the enormous largesses levied upon our people were made possible by the consequences of war and have been made profitable to the manufacturers who have been thereby enabled to maintain the prices of war in time of peace.

15. That the farmer and laborer are plundered by war taxes under the specious guise of protection to both.

16. That England, like Carthage, has made herself mistress of the seas by the vastness of her commerce while we are impoverishing our people by a denial of intercourse with the commercial world.

17. That we have no ships to float our productions, and our mails are carried under the British flag.

18. That the system which this bill is intended to perpetuate has given half the wealth of the country to three hundred men and is reducing the masses of the people to vassalage and to bondage.

19. That the men who are most clamorous for this kind of protection are the millionaires and monopolists.

20. That Mr. Carnegie's million-dollar castle in Scotland and Mr. Gould's five million private fortress in Mexico are twin illustrations of Republican protection to labor.

21. That this bill involves a rapid rush in the transition already far advanced from a free people to a condition of landlordism and tenantry throughout the Republic.

22. That the depressions and panics, the wants of employment, the commercial disasters, the lockouts and strikes, the complaints of labor, and the impoverishment of the farm, the millionaire and the tramp have alike for a quarter of a century exemplified the power as they have illustrated the process of Republican protection.

These and kindred propositions have developed all along the line, and upon them the political parties have divided. I shall not undertake to repeat these discussions. They are on the record and before the country. The condition which they depict has been approached by degrees. It could never have been reached directly. No people were ever enslaved by their voluntary assent. Like the noiseless creep of the tiger before he springs, like the insidious ravage of disease before it racks the flesh and dims the eye, the citadel of human liberty is undermined before the call "to the tower" is heard. And so of extortion upon the earnings of the masses. The open demand for tribute that would encounter prompt rebuke at the hands of the multitude finds easy and successful substitution in the evasive process whereby its beneficiaries declare dividends of the earnings of labor and marshal their assets of its surrendered reward.

So it is true, Mr. President, that while platforms of political parties have not demanded the imposition of a tax upon the people for protection only, the debates which have occurred at various periods in the consideration of the subject disclose the fact that legislation itself has not been based upon that idea.

The history of tariff enactments in the United States is illustrative

and instructive. The subject has been discussed in its relation to protection at every stage of the country's progress. If there be an exception to this proposition it covers a period from the breaking out of the civil war to the tariff enactment of 1867.

During that period larger burdens were imposed upon the people by impost duties and otherwise than at any time in the history of the country. But during that period the question of protection was not a factor that entered into the debate. The truth is that the exigencies and consequences of war fixed the standard of our tariff exactions upon the people of the country, and the fact is that now and here, twenty-five years after the war, when no demand it created is pressing upon the Treasury, when the people are paying through their public officials 24 per cent. premium on their outstanding indebtedness, not yet due, and when they do not need more money, but less money in their Treasury, they are confronted by a conspiracy between certain political elements of the country and the beneficiaries of war rates of taxation to continue and perpetuate the burdens and calamities of war forever. The specious manner in which this scheme is to be accomplished may facilitate but can not justify these exactions.

As far back as 1868 the Republican party declared in its national platform that it was "due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the national faith would permit." It has redeemed that pledge by increasing the burdens of labor and production from that day to this.

Speaking of Hamilton and his theories of protection, which have been inherited and exaggerated by the Republican party, Mr. Blaine declares that—

More promptly than any other financier of that century he saw that \$10 could be more easily collected by indirect tax than \$1 by direct levy.

This declaration of Mr. Blaine's furnishes the key to the whole process by which the burdens and exactions made upon the American people have been augmented and increased and multiplied until they have walked their various ways under a load more weary and a system more extortionate than any other people ever bore on the face of the earth. It is more easy, Mr. Blaine concedes, to levy tribute upon the American citizen by adding \$10 to the price of his clothes than \$1 on the valuation of his cow. It is more easy, as Mr. Blaine has declared, to extract from the earnings of the laboring man by an additional charge of 10 cents upon his tin-plate than 1 cent by arbitrary exaction in the direct demand for his coin.

It is more easy, as Mr. Blaine has declared, to absorb indirectly from the earnings of the masses one hundred millions to be squandered in reckless expenditure under the ingenious guise of protection to the very men who dig it from the ground or harvest it in the field, than to collect ten millions by direct levy in dollars and cents from a manly populace who would want to know, as they have a right to know, for what public use their money is demanded. It is by this process that the burdens of war have been maintained till the generation that fought it is well-nigh passed from the activities of life.

Prior to the rebellion of 1861 no man dreamed of the imposition of impost duties at any such rate as is now enforced. I have endeavored to show that no political platform demanded larger imposition of taxes than would meet the requirements of Government economically and honestly administered. It is a remarkable fact that up to and including the year 1861 the largest amount of money ever collected by

the Government in a single year was in round figures \$83,000,000. This statement covers incomes from all sources—impost duties, direct taxes, sales of public lands, fines and penalties, Patent-Office fees, every dollar from all sources received into the public Treasury of the United States. This year of 1890 by this Congress the amount of appropriations to be expended for pensions alone will exceed \$120,000,000. The total collections during the past fiscal year from tariff duties amounted to \$229,000,000. The total appropriations for all purposes by this Congress for the current fiscal year will amount to \$460,000,000.

Mr. President, these figures are startling. When we add the further consideration that the nine States of the Union most largely engaged in manufacturing possess more wealth than the other thirty-three States and the Territories all combined, it is astounding beyond man's conception that under the financial conditions which I have related these are the nine States which, through their interested elements, are clamoring for the perpetuation of the burdens of war for their protection and the maintenance and advancement of their fortunes. By the census of 1860 the six New England States, with New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania added, owned 34 per cent. of the wealth of the country. By the census of 1870 these nine States had advanced to more than 50 per cent. of our aggregate wealth, although nearly five years of devastating war had intervened.

Thus the infant industry which had been fostered by paternal care until he was grown to be a giant, turned with ravenous hand upon the old man's purse now that he was beset by dangers, sore in his needs, and writhing in the agonies of blood! And so the rate has kept up. The capital and deposits in the nine manufacturing States amount to nearly three billions and a half, while in all the other States and Territories they amount to less than two billions. How long, Mr. President, will it be under this system before these nine States shall own the Union? But did I say States? Ah! sir, it is misleading to call them States in this connection. The States are the people. It is not the people of these States that have amassed this immense wealth. It is the favored and pampered few. The people in these States are doomed to the common fate.

From 1870 to 1880, and we have not the tables for 1890, the value of farms, animals, implements, and machinery in these nine States fell off \$517,000,000. And so they have continued to fall. We are apt to deal with figures too lightly. We have been made so accustomed by the conditions which followed the war to talk in Congress about millions and hundreds of millions, and the people have become so familiar with the discussion of vast amounts in connection with the administration of their Government, that all lose sight of the magnitude of the subject and the vastness of the public collections.

But the thoughtful mind will not fail to pause for a moment's reflection upon that process, indirect and subtle though it be, which extracts these prodigious sums from the pockets of the people. Although, as Mr. Blaine has declared, it is easier to collect ten dollars by this method than it would be to collect one by direct taxation, this method itself is becoming better understood. But the classes and interests which are subserved by the maintenance of these burdens are not satisfied to stop there. They are not content to base their profits upon the exactions imposed by the exigencies of war. They are actually demanding, and in the name of labor, that these burdens shall be multiplied.

Mr. President, if a single tithe of the advantage which arises from



the burdens of tariff tax contributed to the advancement of the labor of the country or added to the comfort of the wives and the little ones of our laboring population, no man would go further than I to secure them that tithe. Nor am I unwilling, so far as the public necessities require public taxation, so to adjust the details that the manufacturers themselves may, with the great body of their fellow-citizens, share equally both its benefits and its burdens. If money must be levied for public purposes in one form or another, and so it will have to be as long as the Government lasts, the details should be so adjusted, within the limits of public necessity, as to reserve to our own people, whether engaged in one pursuit or another, every advantage which may tend to mitigate or counterbalance the burdens they bear.

But the demand of the manufacturers that the exorbitant rates in most instances now enforced shall be increased for the benefit of labor requires investigation and analysis. These rates were not established to promote the interests of labor. The attempt to maintain them does not emanate from the laboring population. They involve a tax and a burden upon labor in every form and sphere of its employment. Their beneficiaries are those who have levied tribute upon labor from the beginning until now. This fact is demonstrated by even a cursory examination of the relations in which labor was held by the promoters of high tariffs at critical periods of legislation on the subject. Take, for instance, the first tariff enactment which bears date July 4, 1789. It was introduced by Mr. Madison, entitled, "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States." It recited in its first clause that—

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported, etc.

Here was the avowed and declared object of encouragement and protection to *manufactures*. But who will say that the protection of labor bore any relation to this scheme? The country had been through an exhaustive war. It had seen the want of manufacturing development. It saw and felt the need of manufacturing establishment to maintain, as it had seen and felt the need of manufacturing establishment to assert and secure, its independence.

But where was the labor to be benefited by the act? It could not have been skilled labor, for that we did not have. It could not have been general labor, for even of that there was scarcity and want. Mr. Harrison in his letter of acceptance recognizes the condition which existed when he declares that—

In the earlier years of our public history public agencies to promote immigration were common. The pioneer wanted a neighbor with more friendly instincts than the Indian. Labor was scarce and *fully employed*.

It is thus demonstrated that the inauguration of our tariff system, while it had primarily for its object the raising of revenues to support the Government and meet its obligations, was aimed in its protective features, not to the advancement of labor, but to the establishment and maintenance of manufactures. It is as true now as it was true then, that while the duties amounted to a restriction upon foreign competition to the manufacturer, the employers of labor, by the immigration societies to which Mr. Harrison alludes, and by other processes, were looking to all the world for cheap and *competitive labor* as they are looking to-day.

The theory and purpose of this original bill were followed for years in subsequent enactments. The protection of infant industry, the promotion of manufacturing independence, and the creation of American resources for the exigencies of war were the prime considerations which, next to the raising of revenue, governed the advocates of high rates of duty. But through all the controversies from 1789 to 1861 no man advocated for protection, in or out of Congress, exactions which approached the rates of the present law.

By the various tariff enactments from 1789 to 1861 the country alternated, according to its condition and to popular sentiment, between what we call free trade and moderately protective tariff. The act of 1833, known as the compromise measure, provided, as we all know, under the leadership of Henry Clay, for the gradual reduction of all duties to 20 per cent. Mr. Clay's avowed object in advocating this measure was to save from utter destruction the protective system, which he acknowledged to be in danger; and so it was in danger, because of its exactions upon the people; but these exactions which had thus created popular revulsion were in no sense the exactions of to-day. The tariff act of 1846, known as the Walker tariff, was likewise known as a free-trade tariff. Subsequently modified, the country found itself substantially under a free-trade system when the war broke out.

Now, Mr. President, at this point, it is well for us to stop to consider. The Government was confronted by impending war. Its Treasury was inadequate or supposed to be inadequate to the terrible ordeal.

Mr. Blaine declares, and declares truly, "that with the information which was then before the world it may be questioned whether a complete scheme for providing the money necessary for the struggle could have been passed through Congress or rendered effective with capitalists. The needs of each crisis were supplied as each arose. Congress did not try to look far into the future. It exerted itself to give daily bread to the armies of the Union, to provide munitions of war, to build and equip the Navy."

Mr. President, it is the truth of history that the enactments of 1860, 1861, 1864, and 1867 were made to meet the exigencies and consequences of war. Contemporaneous discussion places this proposition beyond the pale of controversy. Reporting the first bill of 1860, Mr. MORRILL, who had it in charge, declared that there were—

no duties proposed on any article for the simple purpose of protection alone. The highest duties in the bill were proposed for the purpose of revenue. The manufacturers might get along with lower duties, but we require the revenue.

And again in 1861, speaking on the bill to increase the duties on tea, coffee, and sugar, the same gentleman declared it to be "apparent that we need to husband all our resources." And again in 1861 he said:

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that to the whole of this Senate amendment I have very strong objections, and it is only from the necessity under which the Government lies to raise more revenue than we shall probably be able to raise without this tax on tea and coffee that I should be willing to consent to it.

And still again in 1861 Mr. MORRILL declared—

I may say with reference to this bill that while it does not meet my entire and cordial support yet I mean to give it my vote. I believe that the duties on most articles are put too high.

And in 1864, reporting a bill still further to increase taxation, Mr. MORRILL declared, and there were none to gainsay it—

This is intended as a *war measure*, a temporary measure, and we must as such give it our support.

In the same speech he used the following expressions:

In making an estimate of the effect of such a *war tariff* as is now proposed it is important that we should bear in mind that as we increase the cost of any article we diminish the number of those who will be able to consume it.

And, Mr. President, at another period in these debates, to give emphasis to the idea that all these exactions were based upon public necessity as against the demands of individual or corporate cupidity, the same distinguished Representative from Vermont, now a venerable and honored associate on this floor, declared to the Congress and to the country that it was "unfit that the Government of the United States should go to bed without its supper every time the revenues fell off a million in New York." And thus we have the starvation of the Government pleaded suppliantly for the imposition of burdens which, now that the occasion of their enactment has passed, are to be maintained in the interest of money and monopoly as against labor and consumption.

No pretense was offered that these increases of taxation were made in the interest of manufacturers—silent spectators of current events, they saw that the calamities of war were promoting a system which from the very necessities of the situation would enrich their coffers. No voice was raised for labor. But contemporaneously with these enactments labor was likewise a subject of consideration, and what consideration did it receive from the men who composed the Congress of that day?

In 1864, at the very crisis of these discussions, a bill was passed not to increase tariff taxes for the protection of labor, but side by side with the imposition of fresh burdens, as if in mockery of their relation to labor, a bill was enacted to provide for the importation of contract labor from abroad. The bill provided that foreign laborers to be imported by such contracts—the contracts themselves, when made in foreign countries, to be legalized here—should pledge the wages of their labor for the term of a year to their employers. Mr. SHERMAN, who managed and passed the bill, declared on the floors of Congress that—

In the Western States labor is absolutely demanded. Common laborers are receiving a *very high price*.

And, mark you, it was not the so-called protected labor of our factories in the East that was commanding this very high price, but the unprotected labor of the "Western States."

Mr. President, the enactment of tariff legislation from 1860 to 1864, with the act of 1867 added, created substantially the system which is in force to-day. Who will declare, who can declare that the protection of labor or the promotion of its well-being had any place in the minds of men in these tariff enactments when in the very same day and hour they were providing for the importation of foreign contract labor on the ground that labor was commanding a very high price in this country? Strangely enough, the first tariff bill introduced by Mr. Madison, when, as President Harrison says, labor was scarce and fully employed, in 1789, bore date the 4th of July, as did also the act which Mr. SHERMAN passed when he declared that labor was commanding a very high price in this country in 1864. But the war ended. Many of its consequences still remained. Among these was the vast indebtedness it had created.

In 1866 the public debt reached its maximum. The public revenues fell off in that year \$535,000,000. With this extraordinary condition of the country came the necessity for further increase of public taxes for public revenue. Taxes, including tariffs, were carried to the verge

of desperation, and THESE ARE THE TARIFF TAXES WE ARE PAYING TO-DAY. Well may Mr. Blaine, describing the conditions of that period, quote Sydney Smith:

We were levying taxes upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot; taxes on everything which it is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, or taste; taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion; taxes on everything on the earth and the waters under the earth; taxes on everything that comes from abroad or is grown at home; on the sauce which pampers man's appetite and on the drug that restores him to health; on the ermine which decorates the judge and the rope which hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt and the rich man's spice; on the brass nails of the coffin and the ribbons of the bride.

Any fair inquirer into this vast and important subject must be convinced that the culmination of 1867 in the enactment of tariff duties by the United States Government brought us substantially to the rates that are in force at this time. They were enacted without a pretense of protection, without the slightest regard to manufactures or a thought of their effect upon labor. They were the plain, simple, direct, immediate, and necessary consequences of war. But if there be one in any quarter so bold as to ascribe to the party then in power a regard for labor in this great emergency, the action of the same agencies within the brief period of one short year will forever dispel the illusion.

It was in 1868, Mr. President, that the articles were agreed between this country and China, additional to the treaty of 1858. The act to promote the importation of foreign contract labor had passed in 1864. It had evidently failed of its object. It was declared by Mr. SHERMAN on this floor, when I had quoted his connection with that act, that it was made necessary because so many of our citizens were with the armies in the field; but if that had been the spirit of the enactment it would have been promptly repealed when the survivors of the war returned, seeking employment, to their homes. It had evidently failed to accomplish its object. Labor was doubtless, in the estimation of these gentlemen, still commanding a very high price, because within a short year, as I have stated, after the increase of tariff taxes in 1867, additional articles to the treaty with China were negotiated by the Republican administration.

By the fifth of these articles the great promoters of protection to labor solemnly contracted that—

the United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the *mutual advantage* of free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as *permanent residents*.

So we have in the one instance, fathered and fostered and promoted by these friends of American labor, in 1864 an act to promote the importation of foreign contract-labor cotemporaneously with the increase of burdens upon our labor at home; and in the other instance, a sweeping invitation and the opening wide of our doors to myriads of Chinese paupers, who were seeking our shores to take the place of our honest and industrious labor, in 1868 cotemporaneously with the enactment which added largely to the burdens of every man, woman, and child in the country! And this was protection to American labor!

But there is another chapter to this Chinese question. When the Democrats acquired control of the House of Representatives, when the protest of American labor against cooly importation amounted, especially in the far West, to open revolt, an act was passed prohibiting the immigration of Chinese and excluding them from our shores for twenty

years. This act was defeated by the protest and veto of a Republican President. In its consideration here it was embarrassed and hindered by Republican obstruction. Mr. HOAR, of Massachusetts, sought to amend it by providing that it should "not apply to any skilled laborer who shall establish that he comes to this country without any contract by which his labor is the property of any person other than himself," and he was supported in this proposition by the votes of Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. MORRILL, three of the six Republican Senators who report the pending bill. Failing in that proposition through Democratic votes, Mr. HOAR further moved that—

Any laborer who shall receive a certificate from the United States consul at the port where he shall embark that he is an artisan coming to this country at his own expense and of his own free will, and has established such fact to the satisfaction of such consul, shall not be affected by this bill.

He was again supported by Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. MORRILL, three of the Republican Senators who report the present tariff bill, and he was again defeated through the Democratic vote of the Senate.

These amendments, Mr. President, would practically have defeated the object of the Chinese restriction bill. They would have kept open our doors to competition from China with our domestic labor by every cooly who would call himself a skilled laborer or an artisan. When the bill was finally passed it was opposed by the votes of Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. MORRILL, three of the Republican Senators who report the present bill. Thus the modification of that bill as proposed or its defeat would have left in full force the treaty stipulations of 1868, which provided for the unrestricted immigration of the subjects of China. On the passage of the bill it commanded the support of only eight Republican Senators, and four of these represented the States of Colorado, Nevada, and California. It encountered the negative votes of Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. MORRILL, three of the Republican Senators who report the present tariff bill.

But another bill was introduced in Congress which prohibited Chinese immigration for a period of ten years. On an amendment to admit Chinese to citizenship 26 Republican Senators voted "ay" and 5 voted "no." Every Democrat in his place in the Senate voted "no!" On an amendment to strike out the clause which construed the act to mean and to exclude both skilled and unskilled laborers 29 Republican Senators voted "ay" and only three voted "no." Every Democratic Senator voted "no!" And so the parties were divided upon other and similar propositions. On the passage of this bill Mr. SHERMAN voted "no."

We thus have Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ALLISON, Mr. ALDRICH, and Mr. MORRILL, *four of the Republican Senators out of the six who report the present tariff bill*, on the record in favor of the protection of American labor by refusing restrictions upon Chinese immigration! It was reserved to a Democratic Administration under Grover Cleveland to negotiate the treaty of 1888 by which Chinese labor is to be excluded for twenty years from March of that year. The act of Congress would have expired and admitted the Chinaman after the 1st of May, 1892. Now that the Republicans have ten majority in the Senate, the same proportion of their number that opposed the bill would defeat its re-enactment. But the treaty concluded by Mr. Cleveland in 1888 covers and excludes Chinese labor.

Mr. President, is further demonstration needed that in all the tariff enactments which accompanied or have followed the war the protec-

tion of American labor was never an element of consideration? If so, it is found in the fact that the labor of our country in every phase and walk of its existence is open to competition, as it has always been open to competition, from every quarter of the globe. If so, it is found in the illustration occurring in a manner local to my own community, under my own eye, during the progress and pending the discussion of this very bill.

While this Senate was engaged in the debate on the schedule embracing building stone, limestone, and other material of that kind, and certain gentlemen were insisting upon certain additions to the list for the protection of labor, sixty Italian stone-cutters, subjects of the Italian king, unable to speak our language, were employing an interpreter at the post-office in my own town to enable them to procure foreign money-orders by which to transmit the wages earned by them on the great Kanawha improvement, under your system of protection to American labor, to their homes and families in Italy.

Thus the money collected by the United States Government from its own people, its laborers included, and appropriated for the prosecution of its great works of public improvement, is paid to foreigners to be forwarded by due course of mail to the Italian provinces for the protection of American labor. And so it has ever been. The laborer, forming the great mass of consumers, has been the first to tax and the last to relieve. The tax on lawyers and doctors and merchants and bankers was repealed; but the tax on pilots and engineers was retained for years. The tax on deeds and bank-checks was repealed; but the tax on hats and boots was retained at war rates. The tax on incomes was wiped from the face of the earth; but the coat and the shirt, the breeches and the blanket, the dress and the cloak and the shawl, the plow and the spade, the pick and the shovel, the chisel and the plane, the plate that holds the hard-earned meal and the fork that carries it to the hungry lip, the blanket that shields the wasting form and the sheet that shrouds it cold in death, go on—like Tennyson's brook—go on forever—levying silent tribute from the weary and the heavy laden, that colossal fortunes may tower to the skies, while "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

KEN

○



