

(Continued from 1st page.)

There are here seven establishments. The first one is in Massachusetts. A comparison is instituted between 1849 and 1884, and the industry is cotton print cloth. Each operative made in 1849 in his factory 44 yards per day; in 1884 he made 98.2 yards, an increase of productive power of 120 per cent. What wages did he get? The average daily earnings of the laborer in 1849 were 66 cents, and in 1884 \$1. His wages increased 50 per cent. The labor cost of the product decreased 32 per cent.

In that same establishment in 1849 the wages of weavers were 63 cents a day, and each man turned out 113 yards of cloth. In 1884 the wages had risen to \$1.06, and each weaver turned out 273 yards of cloth.

During this time we had high tariff and low tariff, but whether high tariff or low tariff, or no tariff, the productive efficiency continued to increase, the multiplication of production by the power of machinery continued to increase, and wages rose with it, and the cost of the product sunk. So that the tariff conferred no benefit on the laborer; none whatever.

Mr. Wright, chief of the labor bureau, instituted a most painstaking examination into the rates of labor in England and Massachusetts a few years ago, and showed the rates of labor are higher in this country than in England; 12 per cent. higher in cotton manufacture, 25 per cent. in the manufacture of woools, 26 per cent. in iron and steel, 128 per cent. in boots and shoes. That would seem to indicate, according to the protectionists, that we are on the road to ruin because our rate of labor is higher than England and other countries. But the reverse of that proposition is true.

Now let me give you an instance here in boots and shoes. If we pay so much higher wages in producing boots and shoes, if the proposition we hear on the other side be true, we cannot enter into any contest with Great Britain when we pay 128 per cent. higher wages than she does. Yet we import no boots and shoes at 30 per cent. duty from England. We make the cheapest boots and shoes and the finest made in the world.

#### PRODUCTIVENESS OF AMERICAN LABOR.

In Massachusetts wages are higher than in Great Britain, but the labor cost of a pair of ladies' shoes in Massachusetts is less than the labor cost of a like pair of shoes in Great Britain. The cost is 25 cents in Massachusetts against 34 cents in England. The labor cost of men's shoes in Massachusetts is 33 cents per pair; the labor cost of men's shoes in England is 50 cents. If our people are to be injured by the importation of English shoes into this country, the English shoe must be produced at a lower cost than the American shoe; otherwise it cannot take the market.

It is not the rate of wages in England and in America that we have to consider, but the labor cost of a pair of shoes.

In order for the American to earn his \$11.63 a week he makes 35 pairs of men's shoes a week; the Englishman, to earn his \$5.08 cents a week, makes 10 pairs of men's shoes. In order for the American workman to earn his \$11.63 per week he makes 46 pairs of ladies' shoes; in order for the Englishman to earn his \$5.08 per week he makes 15 pairs of ladies' shoes.

Mr. Herbert—Free hides also help you out on that point.

Mr. Mills—England also has free hides. A few years ago, in 1879, our English friends across the water took alarm about the growth and development of our cotton industry in the United States, and they sent an expert—a gentleman thoroughly conversant with the cotton business of England—to the United States to make a thorough and searching investigation into the whole business of cotton manufacture in this country, and to report to them whether their industry was imperiled by that of the United States. That gentleman made a thorough and searching investigation, and in every instance he showed that we could produce cotton goods at a lower labor cost than they could be produced at any point in Great Britain.

The following are the rates of wages for weaving and spinning cloths in some of the principal districts of England and America, as shown by his report:

A piece of 28 inches, 56 reeds, 14 picks (7, 60 by 56, 55 yards, costs at Ashton-under-Lyne, in England, 24.68 cents to weave; in Rhode Island it costs 16.82 cents. At Blackburn, in England, it costs 25.4 cents; at Providence, R. I., it costs 17.26 cents; at Stockport, England, 25.4 cents; at Fall River, 19.96 cents; at Hyde, England, 25.28 cents; at Lowell, 19.96 cents. In every instance the labor cost of the production of the cotton goods is lower here than in England. Now let us turn to the summary. At Fall River the wages in a pound of print cloth, about 7 yards, is 6.907 cents; at Lowell it is 6.88 cents; in Rhode Island it is 6.422; in Pennsylvania, 6.44; in England, 6.96 cents. In every place in the United States, in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the labor cost of producing a pound of print cloth was lower than at any point in England.

While the labor cost is lowest in the United States, where the rate of wages is highest, yet when we come to examine the cost of the material, England beats us, because she produces the goods at a total cost lower than ours. It is not the labor that causes this difference; it is the cost of the material. The machinery by which you run your establishments costs you 45 per cent.; your dye stuffs are more costly than in England; all these

things which enter into the manufacture of goods here cost more than on the other side. But do not charge this increased cost to labor. You are not paying the laborer, in proportion to the work that he does, as much as he receives in England.

Mr. Brumm—Did I understand the gentleman to say that the cost of cotton in England was less than the cost of cotton in this country?

Mr. Mills—You understood me to say that the labor cost of producing a pound of print cloth was lower in this country than in England. You understood me further to say that the total cost, including materials and everything else, is lower in England than in the United States.

Mr. Brumm—Therefore, does not that say that cotton, being the raw material out of which the cotton goods are made, must be lower in England than in this country?

Mr. Mills—Oh, no; not at all; of course not.

Mr. Kelley—Mr. Chairman—Mr. Mills—It means that England procures her machinery at less cost than we do ours. It means that England produces the dyes which enter into the manufacture of these goods cheaper because untaxed. That is what it means.

Mr. Kelley—I protest against these interruptions of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. Mills—I do not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Kelley—The gentleman, as the organ of his party, is expounding its doctrine, and these interruptions are, in my judgment, im-

**Mr. Mills—**Now, Mr. Chairman, when we come to look at the total cost of this pound of calico cloth we find that at Fall River it is 14 cents (leaving off fractions); at Lowell, 13 cents; in Rhode Island, 11 cents; in Pennsylvania, 15 cents; in England, 12 cents. England produces the goods at a total cost less than ours, and that gives her the market; but while the goods cost more here, she pays more in the form of wages.

Now, when this gentleman goes back home he reports to his people elaborately. I refer to this little book published in England given to me by my friend, the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, the chief of the bureau of labor. He says:

The United States, while they beat us in labor, while they can produce anything in the cotton business at a labor cost cheaper than we can, are like Ephraim, "wedded to their idols." They maintain high tariff on raw materials, and therefore the cost of materials entering into their manufactures is higher than with us. It will take a great revolution to change their minds on this subject, and as long as they hold to the policy of high tariff on materials which enter into manufactures, you may go to sleep in security, for England holds the markets of the world.

A few years ago, while he was secretary of state, James G. Blaine said in his report, in speaking of the cotton industry:

Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor.

Mr. Charles S. Hill, statistician of the state department, makes a statement that I think is extravagant, and I would not quote it but he is a pronounced protectionist. I would not quote it if he were a revenue reformer, because I think it is too strong.

He says:

Here is the positive proof that American mechanics in the aggregate accomplish exactly double the result of the same number of British mechanics; they are therefore very justly paid double in wages.

Our consul at Tunstall, England, makes this report: That in cotton manufactures our productive capacity is 33 per cent. greater than England and 72 per cent. greater than Germany. In woolen manufactures our productive capacity is 23 per cent. greater than England and 40 per cent. greater than Germany. In silk manufacture our productive capacity is 18 per cent. greater than England and 32 per cent. greater than Germany.

Mr. Ford—That is the product per man?

Mr. Mills—Yes, that is the product per man. Taking that as the average, how is it possible for these countries, where the rate of wages is low and the labor cost is high, how is it possible for those people to bring their product into our markets and drive ours out?

I will refer to another instance before I close, and that is to a table which is to be found in the first annual report of the bureau of statistics, pages 132 and 133, which gives the cost of spinning one pound of cotton yarn in England and in Germany. Germany has a protective duty on cotton yarn, while England welcomes the whole world to compete with her.

ENGLAND AND GERMANY COMPARED.

Is it the tariff that makes English wages higher than German? Germany has the tariff, but England has the trade. If these statements are true, what is there to prevent us from being the greatest manufacturing and exporting country of the world? We are the greatest agricultural people in the world. We exceed all others in the products of manufacture, but we export next to nothing of our product. There is no reason except that high tariffs and trusts and combinations are in our way, and they muster all their forces to prevent us from taking the place which our advantages entitle us to take.

We must make a departure. Instead of laying on the burdens of taxation upon the necessities of life, instead of destroying our foreign commerce, we should encourage it as we would encourage our home commerce.

A gentleman said here the other day, on the other side of the house, that our prosperity in this country was due to the tariff. I deny it. Our prosperity in this country is due to the intelligence of our labor and to the unrestricted movements of our exchanges among sixty millions of people at home. [Applause.]

Our wealth would have been greater as a people if we had none of these restrictions upon our commerce. We will increase wealth if we lower the duties and let importations come in of those things which can be produced cheaper in other countries than in our own.

We will increase the value of all of the agricultural products by such methods. They will diffuse and scatter money among the laboring people throughout the country. It will set the wheels of machinery in motion, lay the foundation of happy homes, and a glad smile will light up the faces of the people in all sections of the country at the returning and increased prosperity of the nation. [Applause.]

This policy which is being pursued now may for awhile satisfy the demands of the capitalist who has money invested in the various factories and enterprises of that kind throughout the country. They may be able by the aid of these pools and trusts and combinations which seem to be springing out of the earth all around us to secure for a time the capital invested; but what, I ask you, is to become in the meantime of the poor laborer when they shut off their fires, when they turn him into the streets and determine that they will limit the product of their establishments in order to keep up prices so as to save the profits of their investments? What is to become of the cotton and the iron and the wool and all of the other interests that depend upon capital invested in manufacturing enterprises? Where are our markets when our factories are closed, when the wheels are still, when the fires are banked and their laborers wandering as paupers around the streets seeking employment which is not to be found anywhere in the land? And yet they call this the American policy!

I repeat it, sir; it is not American. It is the reverse of American. That policy is American which clings most closely to the fundamental idea that underlies our institutions and upon which the whole superstructure of our government is erected, and that idea is freedom—freedom secured by the guarantees of government; freedom to think, to speak, to write; freedom to go where we please, select our own occupations; freedom to labor when we please, and where we please; freedom to receive and enjoy all the results of our labor; freedom to sell our products, and freedom to buy the products of others, and freedom to markets for the products of our labor, without which the freedom of labor is restricted and denied. Freedom from restraints in working and marketing the products of our toil, except such as may

be necessary in the interest of the government. Freedom from all unnecessary burdens: freedom from all exactions upon the citizens except such as may be necessary to support an honest, efficient and economical administration of the government that guarantees him protection to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" freedom from all taxation except that which is levied for the support of the government; freedom from taxation levied for the purpose of enriching favored classes by the spoliation and plunder of the people; freedom from all systems of taxation that do not fall with "equal and exact justice upon all"—that do not raise the revenues of government in the way that is least burdensome to the people, and with the least possible disturbance to their business. That, sir, is the American policy.

Mr. Brumm—Therefore, does not that say that cotton, being the raw material out of which the cotton goods are made, must be lower in England than in this country?

Mr. Mills—Oh, no; not at all; of course not.

Mr. Kelley—Mr. Chairman—Mr. Mills—It means that England procures her machinery at less cost than we do ours. It means that England produces the dyes which enter into the manufacture of these goods cheaper because untaxed. That is what it means.

Mr. Kelley—I protest against these interruptions of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. Mills—I do not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Kelley—The gentleman, as the organ of his party, is expounding its doctrine, and these interruptions are, in my judgment, im-

Now, another thing. I want to show that the tariff is not for the benefit of the workingman. We will have many appeals made to us for sympathy on account of the workingman. I have taken from the first annual report of the commissioner of labor and the report of the census on wages some figures given by manufacturers themselves of the total cost of the product and the labor cost of the articles they are making.

I find in this report one pair of five-pound blankets. The whole cost, as stated by the manufacturer, is \$2.51. The labor cost he paid for making them is thirty-five cents. The present tariff is \$1.90. Now, here is \$1.55 in this tariff over and above the entire cost of these blankets. Why did not that manufacturer go and give that money to the laborer? He is able to do it. Here is a tariff that gives him \$1.50 on that pair of blankets for the benefit of his labor, but notwithstanding that the tariff was imposed for American labor and to preserve high wages, every dollar of that tariff went into the manufacturer's pocket. The poor fellow who made the blanket got 35 cents and the manufacturer kept the \$1.90.

Mr. Crain—Will the gentleman please state how much the committee has reduced that duty?

Mr. Mills—To \$1 from \$1.90.

Take another pair of five-pound blankets. The total cost is \$2.50. The labor cost is 70 cents. The tariff is \$1.55. Now, how strange it is that none of these sums that were intended for the laborer ever get beyond the pocket of the manufacturer. Why is it, when the American congress enacted this legislation for the benefit of our labor, that every dollar of this aid intended for labor, stops in the pockets of the manufacturer, who goes into the highways and hedges and hires his laborer at the lowest price for which he can get him in the markets and then pockets the tariff benefits that we are told every day is intended for the laborer alone—for the benefit of labor?

Here is another pair of five pound blankets. The cost is \$3.39. The labor cost paid by this manufacturer, he says himself, is 61 cents. The tariff is \$2.55. In the pending bill we have left him \$1.35, and we have left the other man \$1.08. And we have left all along not only enough to cover the difference, if there was any difference, between the labor cost of production in Europe and the labor cost of production in this country, but we have left enough to pay for all the labor and a bonus besides.

Let us go a little further. Here is 1 yard of flannel, weighing 4 ounces; it cost 18 cents, of which the laborer got 3 cents; the tariff on it is 8 cents. How is it that the whole 8 cents did not get into the pockets of the laborer? Is it not strange that those who made the tariff and fastened upon the people these war rates in a time of profound peace, and who are now constantly assailing the Democratic party because it is untrue to the workingman, did not make some provision by which the generous bounty they gave should reach the pocket of him for whom they said it was intended? They charge that we are trying to strike down the labor of the country. Why do they not see that the money they are taking out of the hard earnings of the people is delivered in good faith to the workman?

One yard of cashmere weighing 16 ounces costs \$1.28; the labor cost is 29 cents; the tariff duty is 80 cents. One pound of sewing silk costs \$3.63; the cost for labor is 85 cents; the tariff is \$1.69. One gallon of linseed oil costs 49 cents; the labor cost is 2 cents; the tariff cost is 25 cents. One ton of foundry pig iron costs \$11; the labor costs \$1.64; the tariff is \$6.72.

None of these tariff rates go to the laborer. The road is blocked up. They cannot pass the pocket of the manufacturer. This "great American system" that is intended to secure high wages for our laborers is so perverted that all its benefice intended for the poor workman stops in the pocket of his employer, and the laborer only gets what he can command in the open market for his work.

Let us take Bessemer steel rails. We are told that the steel rail industry is in greater danger of utterly perishing away and departing from this continent, because we propose to reduce the duty from \$17 to \$11.

The whole cost is put down at \$21; the labor cost at \$7.57; the tariff is \$17. The manufacturer has \$9.43 more for each ton than all the labor cost.

The labor cost of this ton is exceptionally high. I have a statement of the labor cost of a ton of steel rails at Bethlehem, Pa., taken recently by Mr. Schaefer, and it shows labor cost

\$3.85 per ton. The labor cost of a ton of steel rails in England is not \$1 cheaper than here. Mr. Schaefer informs me that a ton of bar iron costs, for labor, in England about \$7.75, and here about \$8. But let us leave these and proceed with the official figures. A keg of steel nails costs \$2.24; the labor cost is 67 cents, the tariff is \$1.25. A ton of pipe iron costs \$24.57; labor cost, \$12.26; the tariff is \$22.40.

Here is a bar wheel weighing 500 pounds; cost, \$13; labor cost, 85 cents; tariff rate is 2½ cents per pound, equivalent to \$12.50, to cover a labor cost of 85 cents! [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, these laborers of ours ought to get immensely rich if they could get all that congress votes to them, if the manufacturers did not stop the bounties intended by the government to reach the pockets of the workingmen.

Here is a coarse wool suit of clothes such as our working people wear in their daily toil in the shop and field. The whole cost is \$12. The labor cost is \$2. The tariff duty is 40 cents per pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. As the weight of the suit is not given, we cannot get the exact tariff, but the duty on woolen clothes imported last year averaged 54 per cent. and at that rate the tariff stands \$6.48 to cover \$2 of labor cost.

A cotton suit costs \$10.50; the labor cost is \$1.65; the tariff is \$3.67. A dozen goblets cost 48 cents; labor cost, 16 cents; tariff, 19 cents. White lead, by the hundred weight, \$3.50; labor cost, 50 cents; tariff, \$3. A hundred weight of mixed paints, \$3; labor cost, 41 cents; tariff, \$3.

APPEAL FOR RELIEF.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have gone through with a number of articles taken from these official reports made by the manufacturers themselves, and I have shown that the tariff was not framed for the benefit of the laborer, or that, if it was so intended by those who framed it, the benefit never reaches the laborer, not a dollar of it. The working people are hired in the market at the lowest rates at which their services can be had, and all the "boodle" that has been granted by these tariff bills goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. It builds up palaces; it concentrates wealth; it makes great and powerful magnates; but it distributes none of its benefice in the homes of our laboring poor.

Now, gentlemen, the time has come, after all these taxes on wealth have been swept away, after the people of this country have been bearing for years these enormous burdens that have been levied on the necessities of life; now, when "trusts" and "combinations" and "pools" are arising around all us to limit production, to increase prices, to make the laborer's lot harder and darker—now the time has come for us to do something, not for the classes, but for the great masses of our people.

I hope and trust that the bill which we have presented to you and which has met with favor throughout the whole country will receive a majority of your votes, a majority of the votes of the senate, and become a law. I earnestly hope, when the treasury is full to overflowing of the people's hard earnings, you will lighten their burden and reduce the taxes on the necessities of life.

Although the bill we propose is not all that we could have asked, although it is a very moderate bill, yet it will send comfort and happiness into the homes and bosoms of the poor laboring people of this country, and I ask you now in behalf of them to consider their claims and help to reduce the burdens that have so long been laid upon their shoulders.

[Enthusiastic applause on the Democratic side, and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

#### Don't Experiment.

</