

### Our Monopoly-Fostering Tariff.

J. S. Moore, in a letter to the New York *Times*, taking as his text an extract from a speech of Hon. Wm. L. Scott, made at Erie, Pa., on the 30th ult., shows in a very clear light the tribute which the tariff enables the iron and steel monopolists of the United States to levy from the consumers. Eighteen months ago Mr. Scott bought 10,000 tons of steel rails from a Pennsylvania rolling mill, paying \$25.50 per ton therefor—a price perfectly satisfactory to the seller. There was then no combination of the steel mills of the country. Six months later a combination was effected, and now the price of steel rails is \$33 per ton. The advance in the cost of production since Mr. Scott made his purchase does not exceed \$2.50 per ton, leaving an advance in steel rails of \$5 per ton without any necessity for it. The steel rail mills produce 1,500,000 tons of steel rails a year, so that the additional profit of \$5 per ton amounts to \$7,500,000, to be annually divided between the seven or eight mills. The railroads, said Mr. Scott, do not pay this excessive profit. They "simply advance the money, and it is you who travel over the railroads, and who transport your merchandise and produce over them, who in the end pay this excessive profit to the manufacturers. It comes at last upon the people."

The duty on steel rails is \$17 a ton. The price paid in England, when Mr. Scott bought his rails, was about \$17.50. With the duty, freight, and cost of handling, the cost of foreign rails in the United States would be about \$36. The steel rail makers of the United States, by combining, forced the price up to \$33. The duty alone made this possible—alone made it possible to plunder the people.

In 1880, Mr. Moore points out, the total capital invested in steel production in this country was \$20,975,393; the wages paid, \$4,930,349; the total value of production, \$55,805,210. The steel rail product of 1880 was \$37,403,625; the wages in round numbers, \$3,700,000, or about \$5 per ton. Wages are not higher now than in 1880, and the wages paid for the production of 1,500,000 tons of steel rails will not exceed \$7,500,000. This is the amount of the extra profit which the combination enabled the steel manufacturers to make—that is, the combination reimbursed themselves for the sum paid for the wages of producing the 1,500,000 tons of rails.

Mr. Moore is perfectly convinced that a duty of \$10 per ton would be more than ample, not only to protect our manufacturers of rails, but even keep foreign rails out. But it would also give consumers steel rails \$6 or \$7 a ton cheaper. A \$10 duty could not possibly reduce wages, but it would materially reduce the enormous profits of the monopolists.

Mr. Moore places in parallel columns a statement made by Mr. Scott, on the authority of the greatest purchaser of steel rails in the United States, that the principal point of contention in the Board of Directors of a Pennsylvania iron and steel company, with a capital of \$10,000,000, has been whether or not they should make an extra dividend of \$10,000,000, and an extract from James M. Swank's report to the Census Bureau in 1880, showing that the average wages paid the 140,978 persons employed in the iron and steel industry were \$393.51 for each person, and that the average hours of labor per week was sixty-five. The average daily pay of unskilled labor was \$1.24. It takes over 26,881 workingmen working 300 days per year to produce for themselves the equivalent of the extra \$10,000,000, which, as Mr. Moore puts it, proves such a source of trouble to the directors of the bloated protected iron and steel corporation of Pennsylvania.—*Detroit Free Press.*

### The Cobden Club.

Among the strange political phenomena which we never could understand is the "round of applause" that a stump orator always gets when he stops for a moment in his argument, and shies a metaphorical dead cat at the "Cobden Club." We have seen this trick performed with the most gratifying success a hundred times out here in the West, not only in Chicago, but even in the country, at meetings composed of farmers and dealers in agricultural supplies. We never could furnish an explanation for this eccentricity but the excuse of boundless ignorance. That a gathering composed largely of Illinois farmers or of Chicago traders should stigmatize and denounce the Cobden Club is a phenomenon which cannot be explained on any theory of sanity or ordinary intelligence. If the Cobden Club existed for the purpose of excluding American products from England there would be something rational in denouncing it, but the very reverse is the case. There is something sensible in our complaints against France and Germany for excluding our pork, but what sense is there in reviling the Cobden Club, which actually prevents great Britain from doing the same thing? The Cobden Club is the one supreme commercial friend we have in Europe, the one institution that may be said to keep watch and ward over American interests in the old world, and especially over the interests of Illinois and Chicago. Every attempt to exclude Illinois products from Great Britain has been resisted and defeated by the Cobden Club, and yet an Illinois gathering will applaud the orator who selects it for censure and denunciation. There is a stone-wall stupidness in this that is not creditable to Illinois.

The greatest friend that Illinois ever had among foreign statesmen was Richard Cobden. We do not mean in a sentimental way, but in a practical, material way. He was the great leader of the commercial revolution that made every port in Britain an absolute free market for everything we make, from a ship to a paper of pins, and for everything we can raise, from an ox to a can of tomatoes. The Cobden Club is an institution founded on his principles and carrying out his policy. Largely through his influence the Illinois farmers, millers, and stock-raisers are in absolute possession of the only free market for their produce among the great nations of the earth. If there were a Cobden Club in France, and another in Germany, it would be better for the farmers of Illinois. When all the nations of the earth except England show us commercial hostility, we display our green-eyed illiberal by sneering at the friendly policy of the Cobden Club.

The Cobden Club exists for the "protection of American industry," not for its injury. The Tory party in England is largely a conspiracy against American productions. It insists that the English ports be closed against the wheat, and corn, and beef, and pork of Illinois. It demands the exclusion of American products from Great Britain by a high protective tariff. The Cobden Club exists for the very pur-

pose of defeating this conspiracy, and will not allow any tax, tribute, or impost whatever to be levied upon American products, except on spirits and tobacco; and on them "for revenue only."—*Tariff-Gatherer.*

### Free Trade Facts.

A correspondent asks if we can name any "free-trade facts"—if there really are "any facts favoring free trade." We could fill a year's *Million* with nothing else. The fact is that all the facts are on our side of this great discussion. The greatest theorists, the most absolute and monumental moonshiners, are the protectionists—and they always have been in just this category. But let us take a few of these facts, entirely at random, and let it be understood that they can be multiplied indefinitely.

One of the greatest and most patent facts is that for three thousand miles east and west, and fifteen hundred miles north and south, between all the States of the Union, with the greatest possible diversity of local interests, local advantages, climate, soil, mineral and other resources, general production, and labor and wages—free trade, absolute has prevailed for just a century, and with universally admitted beneficial results.

Another fact is that the average wages of all engaged in the production of iron ore in the United States, is the veriest trifly over a dollar a day. The unprotected farms pay better than that.

Another fact is that more than a hundred years ago, when there was no tariff at all and England was doing her best to break down the colonial industries, we manufactured pig-iron and shipped it and sold it in England—and at a profit at that!

Think of this fact. Massachusetts is a highly protected State, with a large Congressional delegation. In Lawrence, one of the most highly protected cities in the State, capital invested in manufactures has made a net gain of over 20 per cent. per annum for twenty consecutive years. The wages of the "highly protected" laborers in these same manufactures is now about 85 cents a day for men and 65 cents a day for women! child-labor, of which there is altogether too much, is "thrown in."

The Fall River (Massachusetts) protected pay the stockholders about forty-six per cent. per annum—and the protected laborer about (average) \$200 per annum.

Cut this fact out and stick it in the top of your hat, ready for the next high tariff man that blows his ancient horn in your ear. From 1830 to 1830 is called the low tariff period; from 1860 to 1883 has been a high old tariff period. Now see the results—facts:

Advance of Wages.	Advance of Prices.	Net Gain.
1831-1860, per cent...0.6	12.7	37.9
1860-1883, per cent...24.1	14.5	9.9

That hits hard, doesn't it?

Here's another. For several years the combined Bessemer steel companies paid the St. Louis Vulcan Iron Works \$70,000 per annum to lie idle and give them the control of the market. Yet they need protection "to enable them to better remunerate American labor."

A fact well worth remembering and quoting is that nine-tenths of our real American labor has been driven out of the "protected" manufactories to make room for "the pauper labor of the effete old world."

It is a fact that the protected labor of this country is but one-twentieth of the whole.

Our increase of wealth per inhabitant under low tariff for twenty years—1840 to 1860—was 130 per cent.; under high tariff, 1860 to 1880, it was only 86 per cent. Between 1850 and 1860 it was 66 per cent.; 1870 and 1880, 22 per cent. Give this to some tariff "fact" hunter.

The *Manufacturer and Industrial Gazette*, Holyoke, Mass., admits that "the English cotton weaver receives (average) twenty-four per cent. higher wages than the American weaver." Throw this brick at the right man!—*The Million.*

### The Tariff and Commerce.

There is a set of protectionists in this country who pretend to think, and possibly do think, that a high protective tariff and a large trade with foreign nations can co-exist; and they are clamorous for both.

Even our Congressman, in his great subsidy speech, uses this language: "Other countries, with the products of which our come in contact and competition, have aided by subsidies their commercial appliances, so far that if individual enterprise is left to cope unaided with these they must be driven out in the unfair contest." This is but another form of saying that if we would but subsidize our merchant marine, so it could carry goods and products as cheaply as others, we could successfully compete with the products of others in the world's markets. There is vast deal of moonshine about the position of Mr. Price. If he is right, our manufacturers do not need the protective tariff at all; all that is required is that our "commercial appliances" be subsidized. The argument is that our people can produce just as cheaply as any people, and can compete with them anywhere, if they can only get cheap ocean transportation. Eliminate the factor of protection from our commercial policy, which largely increases the cost of production here, by means of heavy duties on the raw materials, and place in its stead a good liberal free-trade policy, and no doubt our nation could successfully compete with any nation in the world's markets. But handicapped with the tariff, such competition becomes extremely difficult, if not impossible. If our people cannot compete with the cheap productions of other countries in our own markets, how do we expect to do so in external markets, even if ocean transportation is free?

But the fact is that a good foreign trade and a protective tariff cannot exist at the same time. If we will not trade with external nations our merchant vessels must float in our harbors idle. Why is this? Simply this: The purchasing power of a nation consists almost wholly of its productions. If we shut our markets against foreign merchandise and competition, other nations cannot trade with us, if they are ever so much inclined to. They must be able to sell to us their productions or they cannot purchase our productions. These principles are so simple and elementary that they need not be here elaborated. All liberal men accept them as self-evident or first truths. So when we restrict or prohibit the importations of the productions of other nations, to that extent we restrict our trade with them. An ocean full of vessels may be largely subsidized, and the markets of the civilized world may be filled with Americans trying to extend our trade, and our commerce will not be enlarged to any material extent. It has always required, and always will require, two parties to a sale or exchange. There can be no seller without a

buyer, there can be no exchange except between two parties. Trade and commerce are founded upon a necessary mutuality. If our nation would sell we must buy. If we wish to sell in the markets of other countries we must give those countries the benefit of our markets. Subsidizing our ocean transports, with the robber tariff in full operation, is like the foolish attempt of lifting one's self by the boot straps.

It is our villainous tariff system that has driven our merchant marine from the ocean, and that system must die if our commerce is to revive and live.—*Jackson County (Wis.) Journal.*

### The Iniquity of the Copper Tariff.

There are many more disastrous chapters in our tariff history than that relating to the copper duties; there is none that exhibits more directly the essential immorality and the certain results of ultra-protection. There was never, in the first place, the slightest excuse for a duty on copper. The sole source of domestic supply, up to fifteen years ago, was the Lake Superior mines. These could have been worked to advantage in free competition with the world. But the owners wanted a monopoly, and when everybody else was having a tariff slice they got theirs. Still, under the original tariff, Chilean ore could be imported, and there were large smelting works in Boston and Baltimore. This did not suit the mine owners at all; and so, regardless of the fact that the whole country was asked to pay a tax for their benefit, and of the farther fact that the smelting industry would be utterly destroyed, as it was, to build up the mining industry, they asked and received in 1869 an increase of duty about equal to that from 5 to 25 per cent. After this copper mining became a close corporation. The companies combined and set an arbitrary price upon their product. This every American consumer had to pay, at the same time that these same companies were selling abroad their surplus product at prices far below the American market. The wages paid were those fixed by the competition of the market. The profits of the mining companies were among the largest known. These enormous profits, together with the discovery of other deposits in Montana and Arizona, caused the mining business to be overdone. The price of the metal fell heavily. The duty was cut down in 1883 from 5 to 4 cents per pound. But overproduction continued until something had to be done to restore the magnificent dividends of the past. What is the remedy? Mines are shut down and hundreds of men will be thrown out of employment until the price has been raised again, to the level of the profit that the manufacturer requires. When the market was good, laborers received the ruling wages, not a penny more, and the tax levied on every user and manufacturer of copper in the country went to swell the fortunes of the mine-owner. When the scramble for these profits overdoes the business, and times become bad, the laborer makes the sacrifice by being deprived of work, and cut off from wages until the monopoly created by the tariff sees fit to resume business.

In the history of this, perhaps the least excusable of all our tariff iniquities, we have an illustration of the invariable working of high and useless duties. They begin in extravagant profits for monopolies, and end in industrial prostration; but, from beginning to end, the only individual who cannot possibly gain any benefit whatever, and who bears the heaviest share of the loss, is the workingman. This is the system by which capital has, for nearly a generation, "protected" labor for its own private emolument.—*St. Paul Pioneer-Press.*

### Let Us Have the Figures.

The disclosures made by Representative Scott in his Erie speech suggest a measure to which the manufacturing beneficiaries of protection have no right to object. It will be remembered that Mr. Scott stated that a man who made it his boast that he was a British subject, had pocketed \$5,000 a day for 300 days, or \$1,500,000 in one year, as his share of the profits of an iron and steel manufacturing concern in Pittsburgh, and that he was building a castle in his native land with what he had made out of our tariff for the protection of American labor. It will also be remembered that Mr. Scott stated on the authority of one of the largest purchasers of steel rails in the country—a man who knew exactly what he was talking about—that the principal bone of contention in the board of directors of a certain iron and steel concern had for some time been whether they should declare an extra dividend of \$10,000,000 on a nominal capital of \$10,000,000. It should be borne in mind that this statement was made to Mr. Scott a year ago, when the iron and steel industries were supposed to be, and for some years had been supposed to be, in deep depression and distress.

Now, the thing suggested by these disclosures is that the protected capitalists should be made to disclose the state of their affairs, or go without protection. When they apply to Congress for tariff taxes of 30, 50, 80 per cent., they say in effect that they can not compete against imported goods without such taxes. Congress has a right to know whether they tell the truth. Since they have the benefit of these taxes Congress has a right to demand of them that they show affirmatively from their books just what the taxes are doing for them. That is the least the country has a right to expect from them when they ask it to carry them on its broad shoulders. If they are rolling up wealth by millions at the country's expense, the country has a right to know it. The country has been favored with many statements about wages in the protected industries, and they do not go to show that those who work for hire make much out of the tariff. The worker has been called on to shed light on this subject by telling what wages he gets. Now let his employer be called on to shed more light by telling what profits he gets. As long as he is supported at the public expense the public has a right to know whether he is able to support himself. Let us see who it is that is enriched by the tariff.—*Chicago Times.*

### "The Other Hanson."

Over in the West Division Mr. Theo. Hanson hired a painter to get him up a sign.

"Dere's a Hanson across de street," he explained. "Dey all call him 'Old Hanson,' and me peoples calls 'de oder Hanson.' Now, do de sign right," and he wrote out his name: Theodor Hanson.

The painter was true to his orders. The sign was put up that night: "The Old Hanson."

WHEN doctors give a man up, his chance for life has gone. When lawyers give one up, his money is gone.

### A LONG FAREWELL.

#### The Mortal Remains of Chester Alan Arthur Consigned to Earth.

#### A Large Gathering of Eminent Men Present at the Ceremonies.

New York telegram.

The last night of the loving watch beside the bier of Gen. Chester Alan Arthur, ex-President of the United States, has passed. President Cleveland and Postmaster General Vilas arrived in a carriage direct from the train at 8:20 a. m., and entered the house of mourning. Many people uncovered their heads when the President stepped out of his carriage. Shortly after, Gov. Hill and Judge William Muller arrived and entered the house. They were followed by the Senate committee.

By this time there was a mighty throng of people on the avenue, and the windows of every house were filled with sad faces. There were no services at the house. At 8:30 the black casket, covered with palmetto leaves, sprays of violets, and a wreath of white roses, was lifted by the undertaker's assistants and borne from the room. The silent form of Chester A. Arthur passed through the door of his earthly tenement for the last time, and was reverently placed in the funeral-draped hearse. As the casket came in view of the people in the street every head was bowed reverently, and many eyes filled with tears in the throng thus hushed in the presence of death.

There was no display of pomp or ceremony, no military music or procession, but the mighty throng of sorrowing people bore witness to their love and respect for the deceased statesman.

Next came out of the residence Chester Alan Arthur, Jr., the son of the ex-President. Leaning on his arm, clad in garments of mourning, was his sister, Miss Nellie Arthur. They passed quietly to their carriage, accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. McElroy. Then came Mrs. Caws, Mrs. Haynewton, and Miss Arthur, the sister of the ex-President; Postmaster Masten and his wife, of Cohoes, N. Y., with their son and daughter; President Cleveland, Postmaster-General Vilas, Gen. Martin T. McMahon, John H. Draper, Secretaries Bayard, Whitney, and Lamar; the pall-bearers, consisting of ex-Postmaster General Gresham, ex-Secretaries Lincoln and Chandler, ex-Assistant Postmaster General Hatton, ex-Attorney General Brewster, Lieutenant General Sheridan, Dr. Cornelius R. Agnew, Cornelius N. Bliss, Robert G. Dun, Gen. George H. Sharpe, Charles L. Tiffany, and Cornelius Vanderbilt; Chief Justice Waite and Justices Harlan and Blatchford; Senators Edmunds, Sherman, Logan, Evarts, Hawley, Morrill, Vest, and Gorman, Gen. Stone, and Gov. Hill.

The mourners filled twenty-five carriages, but over one hundred carriages filled with friends, who had been unable to gain admission to the house, followed the procession to the church. All along the line were immense throngs of people who waited in respectful silence while the funeral train passed.

As the casket was borne into the church the choir formed in two files and the clergymen passed between them heading the procession intoning the opening lines of the beautiful Episcopal burial service; the casket was borne up the aisle on the shoulders of the four undertakers' assistants, followed by the pall-bearers, the family, and the immediate friends.

After the services the undertakers' assistants lifted the casket on their shoulders and proceeded slowly out of the church, followed by the pall-bearers, members of the family, President and his Cabinet, Gov. Hill and his staff, and the representatives of the army and navy.

The remains were placed on a train for Albany, where Bishop Doane recited the committal service at the grave. Earth was thrown in the grave and pressed down, and when the dusk of evening began to settle on forest and hill, deaf hands covered the newly made mound with sheets of sod.

### GENERAL KAULBARS.

A Soldier and Diplomat of Distinction.

General Kaulbars, the Russian who for the last few weeks has been the subject of a large share of attention throughout the civilized world, on account of his close connection with the Bulgarian imbroglio, is less than fifty years of age. He is an able soldier, and a statesman and diplomat as well, having devoted years of close study to the politics of Europe and



the East. As the agent of the Czar in Bulgaria he seems to have performed his work well. Gen. Kaulbars was recently recalled by the Czar. Before leaving Sofia he asked the German Consul to protect Russian subjects. The Consul, after consulting his Government, replied that he was willing to protect genuine Russians, but not Montenegrins or Bulgarians. This implies Germany's censure of Russia's protection of the Zankoff and other conspirators. The Czar instructed Gen. Kaulbars to confide Russian subjects to the care of France.

### INDIANA STATE NEWS.

The reports that Secretary Heron, of the State Board of Agriculture, has received indicate that the corn crop in Indiana is not as large as was first estimated. The stalks were badly blown down in many portions of the State, and damaged to some extent. In the southern half of the State the yield has been an average one, but in the northern half the crop has been cut short by the drought. The season has been fair, and