

BLAINE'S INTERVIEW.

A Republican Newspaper on the
Maine Man's Bid for the
Nomination.

A Campaign Conducted on "Slippery
Jim's" Platform Means Cer-
tain Defeat.

[From the Chicago Tribune, hitherto an ardent
Blaine advocate.]

Mr. Blaine's general position in this interview is that the war tariff shall be perpetuated, that tobacco, which he oddly includes among "the necessities of life," shall be made free of tax, and that Congress must devise methods for squandering the surplus by building fortifications that may be blown to smithereens by the next improvement of dynamite weapons, instead of removing it by the obvious and natural plan suggested by the President. This position will not commend itself to the American people, for unquestionably an immense majority believe in remitting a large share of these oppressive tariff taxes which bear upon the producing and consuming classes with crushing weight. It is the weakest ground Mr. Blaine has ever yet occupied, and no national party can expect to go into a Presidential campaign on that issue, no matter who may be its leader, and win.

It is a sufficient explanation of Mr. Blaine's interview that he is a Pennsylvanian. He was brought up in an atmosphere of ultra-protection. He has sat at the feet of the high-tariff Gamaliels of that State, and imbibed their doctrines. Like all Pennsylvanians, Republicans or Democrats, he believes in enormous duties on imports for the purpose of coddling the mill bosses and protecting the so-called "infant industries" which long ago came of age and ought to be able to go alone. Every Pennsylvanian believes that the protective system promotes his interests, and that in promoting his interests it enhances the general good of the public. He also believes that the farmers out West are not injured by paying these enormous war bounties for the goods they consume, provided the tax goes into the pockets of Pennsylvanians. It is needless to say that it is a very narrow view.

Mr. Blaine need not fear that a reduction of the tariff would cause a rush of factory operatives to the country and a consequent impoverishment of agriculture through excessive production and the ruin of the home market. If the wages of operatives are reduced, so will be the expenses of living, and the workers will have no occasion, out of mere spite, to flee the factory towns as the Jews fled Egypt. The declaration that hard times, panics, or any other sudden change in commerce will lead to an invasion of the country by city workers is a prediction often made but never verified. City workmen, accustomed to light labor, short hours, and all the amusements and dissipations of town life, can not be driven into the country and compelled to endure the hard toil, solitude, and isolation of the farm laborer. They will accept any wages in the cities before they will go on the farms. Such has been the universal experience in the hardest of hard times. Deprived of wages and employment, the only city workers who seek the farms are those who were reared in the country and trained in youth to agricultural toil. When such has been the result in the worst panics and periods of depression ever known in this country, Mr. Blaine ought to rid himself of the Pennsylvania notion that a proper and necessary reduction of the excessive profits now made by mill and factory bosses will cause them to close their establishments and discharge their employees, or that the latter will go off in a huff and take to farming.

Thorough Pennsylvanian that he is, Mr. Blaine can hardly treat the tariff question without reviving certain dogmas which are held almost as religion in that State by men of all parties, but which in other sections, and particularly in the agricultural West, receive less and less credence year after year. First comes the familiar declaration that any proposed reduction of duties is in the nature of an attempt to secure "free trade," or the total abolition of custom-house taxation. In fact, no considerable number of people in the United States favor "free trade" or anything approaching it, and moderate protection must of necessity prevail in the future for the reason that the revenue requirements of the Government are such that a scale of duties high enough to be actually protective will be imperative and must be preserved. Theoretically there may be a choice between five distinct policies—viz.: an ultra high tariff like the present, a high tariff like the Clay tariff of 1842, a moderate tariff like that of 1846, a revenue tariff like that of 1857, or absolute free trade. There are many steps and stages between absolute free trade and high bounty protection. Every tariff is protective to the extent of the tax, whether it be 1 per cent, 10 per cent, 50 per cent, or any other amount. The question is simply one of degree, and in the present situation of the Government the only issue is between an excessive tariff or the one substantially like the Clay tariff of 1842 (then considered abnormally high, and higher than any tariff known before the present war tariff was adopted), which will afford moderate, justifiable and properly effective protection. There can be at present no issue of protection versus free trade.

But if Mr. Blaine were nearer the people and would wipe the protection film from his eyes, he would see that the appeal for relief from the internal-revenue tax on tobacco does not come from the consumers but from the manufacturers. The consumers of tobacco have witnessed a reduction in the tax of one-half within the last five years, but they have not been able to perceive a corresponding reduction in the price of the juicy plug or the fragrant cigar. The manufacturer has pocketed the internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

But if Mr. Blaine were nearer the people and would wipe the protection film from his eyes, he would see that the appeal for relief from the internal-revenue tax on tobacco does not come from the consumers but from the manufacturers. The consumers of tobacco have witnessed a reduction in the tax of one-half within the last five years, but they have not been able to perceive a corresponding reduction in the price of the juicy plug or the fragrant cigar. The manufacturer has pocketed the internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

If Congress should adopt Clay's high protective tariff of 1842, and cut off 33½ per cent. from the present excessive duties, the result, according to Mr. Blaine, would be death and destruction to all protected interests. Under the tariff of 1846 the country escaped ruin, Mr. Blaine says, solely because of foreign wars creating a demand for American products, and even as it was we had to endure a heavy drain of gold. At that time Europe furnished no market except for cotton, tobacco, and turpentine, and this country was poor, producing little beyond its own needs. The powerful stimulus of

trade and commerce by the invention of labor-saving machinery had only begun to set in, and the country settled its foreign balances in gold because it could pay easier in the yield of the mines than in the products of factories or farms. The country exported gold because it was the cheapest and best thing to do, and not because that policy was the result of the tariff. Mr. Blaine does not face the situation as it exists to-day. With an increasing scarcity and appreciation of gold, the exhaustion of the arable public domain, and a heavy immigration from Europe, there is no prospect that the prices of farm products or even the wages paid factory operatives will be advanced. The prices of agricultural produce are very low and promise to so continue for an indefinite period. The farmer buying his goods and supplies at a high protective bounty rate must sell his surplus products in the low free-trade markets of the world. If his condition or that of the factory operative is to be improved it must be by reducing the cost of living and cheapening the necessities of life. Higher wages or higher prices for farm products become more and more improbable, and if the great laboring classes of the United States in city and country are to be helped it must be by lessening the cost of living.

THE PAST AGAINST THEM

Tariff-Revision Speeches Deliv-
ered in the Forty-seventh
Congress.

Republican Congressmen Now Protection-
ists Who Then Saw the Necessity
for Reform.

[Washington special to Chicago Tribune, Rep.]
Some of the Republican Congressmen who are criticising the President's message as a free-trade manifesto are thrown into confusion by their own records during the Forty-seventh Congress. This was the Congress which created the Tariff Commission. In the Senate, the third day after its meeting, Morrill, of Vermont, the high priest of protection, introduced a bill to provide the tax goes into the pockets of Pennsylvanians. It is needless to say that it is a very narrow view.

Mr. Blaine need not fear that a reduction of the tariff would cause a rush of factory operatives to the country and a consequent impoverishment of agriculture through excessive production and the ruin of the home market. If the wages of operatives are reduced, so will be the expenses of living, and the workers will have no occasion, out of mere spite, to flee the factory towns as the Jews fled Egypt. The declaration that hard times, panics, or any other sudden change in commerce will lead to an invasion of the country by city workers is a prediction often made but never verified.

City workmen, accustomed to light labor, short hours, and all the amusements and dissipations of town life, can not be driven into the country and compelled to endure the hard toil, solitude, and isolation of the farm laborer. They will accept any wages in the cities before they will go on the farms. Such has been the universal experience in the hardest of hard times. Deprived of wages and employment, the only city workers who seek the farms are those who were reared in the country and trained in youth to agricultural toil. When such has been the result in the worst panics and periods of depression ever known in this country, Mr. Blaine ought to rid himself of the Pennsylvania notion that a proper and necessary reduction of the excessive profits now made by mill and factory bosses will cause them to close their establishments and discharge their employees, or that the latter will go off in a huff and take to farming.

Thorough Pennsylvanian that he is, Mr. Blaine can hardly treat the tariff question without reviving certain dogmas which are held almost as religion in that State by men of all parties, but which in other sections, and particularly in the agricultural West, receive less and less credence year after year. First comes the familiar declaration that any proposed reduction of duties is in the nature of an attempt to secure "free trade," or the total abolition of custom-house taxation. In fact, no considerable number of people in the United States favor "free trade" or anything approaching it, and moderate protection must of necessity prevail in the future for the reason that the revenue requirements of the Government are such that a scale of duties high enough to be actually protective will be imperative and must be preserved. Theoretically there may be a choice between five distinct policies—viz.: an ultra high tariff like the present, a high tariff like the Clay tariff of 1842, a moderate tariff like that of 1846, a revenue tariff like that of 1857, or absolute free trade.

Upon the first proposition—to wit: the necessity for a revision of the tariff—there seems to be no contrariety of opinion. All parties, men of every shade of belief, from the high protectionist to the extreme free-trader, all unite in demanding a readjustment of the present tariff.

These are only samples of what many other Republican members said.

Blaine and the Tobacco Tax.

Mr. James G. Blaine in his Parisian treat is terribly exercised over the fact that President Cleveland classes tobacco among the luxuries. He draws a piteous tale of the millions of men "at work on the farm, in the coal mine, along the railroad, in the iron foundries," etc., to whom the succulent "chaw" of tobacco is a necessity, and expectation an unfailing joy. His heart, too, is wrung at the distress of those untold thousands who "seek the solace of a pipe or cigar after each meal" by reason of the internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

But if Mr. Blaine were nearer the people and would wipe the protection film from his eyes, he would see that the appeal for relief from the internal-revenue tax on tobacco does not come from the consumers but from the manufacturers. The consumers of tobacco have witnessed a reduction in the tax of one-half within the last five years, but they have not been able to perceive a corresponding reduction in the price of the juicy plug or the fragrant cigar. The manufacturer has pocketed the internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

SENATOR HAWLEY says: "It is not the fault of the Republicans that the taxes are so high, and that all this surplus has accumulated. Revenue measures must start in the House, and the Democrats have had the House ten out of twelve years." The Senator is disingenuous. He knows that tariff reform every time has been beaten in the House by the Republicans and the handful of Randall Protectionists, who practically are Republicans on the tariff question; and that, if it had not been beaten there, it would have been beaten in the Republican Senate—and with his assistance, too.

tion of tobacco. In the year 1880 the value of tobacco imports was \$6,179,238, yielding \$4,681,400 duty. In anticipation of the fall in prices prophesied to follow the reduction in the internal revenue on tobacco, in effect May 1, 1883, the imports for that year were forced up to \$10,515,806, on which the duty was \$7,601,638. The receipts for the next year naturally fell off \$8,593,098, from which they have steadily grown until for the year ending June 30, 1887, they were nearly \$12,000,000, from which \$9,127,758 was collected. It is thus apparent that the reduction in the internal tax on tobacco has not discouraged its importation, which in 1887 was nearly half as great again as it was in 1884. And why should it, since the consumer pays just as much for his plug and his cigar as he did before 1883?

Mr. Blaine's sympathy for the consumer is bogus. It is the capitalistic manufacturer of tobacco who wants to be relieved of the tax for his own benefit.—Chicago

News.

A Shameless Misrepresentation.

The Joliet Steel Rail Rolling Mills Company issued an order on Saturday last, shutting down its works for an indefinite period, discharging the men and paying them off. The Superintendent of the mills accompanies the order by the statements that the mills have run steadily for six years, only interrupted by the strike of the employees in 1883, when these were compelled to accept 20 per cent. less wages than was offered them at the beginning of the strike; that the plant is one of the most improved and successful in the world, capable of competing with any works known; that the reasons for the closing of the works are a depression in the rail market and lack of orders; and, finally, that the President's message and the attitude of Congress on the tariff question so unsettled the industry that contracts for 1888 delivery could not be made with any certainty as to prices, while with this uncertainty no orders could safely be contracted for, even if they were to be had.

It is really no more brazen-faced, shameless, and utterly false assertions than are contained in the latter part of this statement could be made by the most unscrupulous demagogue that ever undertook to deceive a people. The facts of the American steel-rail situation are briefly as follows, being condensed from an editorial in the *Bulletin*, the organ of the American Iron and Steel Association, of Nov. 30, several days previous to the publication of the President's message. For several weeks prior to the above date the steel manufacturers waited in vain for orders for rails from the railway companies, the expectancy assuming quite a panicky aspect. Finally, when it became unmistakable that the railroads, the grangers especially, had decided to withdraw for a time from the market, the panic gave place to better feeling on the part of the rail-makers, in view of the estimate that new and old loads would be raised in 1888 at least 75 per cent. as many rails as in 1887. Still, when at the steel manufacturers' meeting, which took place at the middle of November, it was admitted that the railroads did not exhibit a sign of desire to take orders at any deliverable prices, the *Bulletin* outlined their programme by saying that the rail-makers could not be blamed if they should reach the conclusion that it was better for them to close their works than make rails at a loss.

This is reality, is what the rail-makers had, at that time, concluded to do in order to bring the railroads to their terms. Now, while the above programme is being carried out, it is sought to make a political question out of a fight between the steel-rail octopus trust and the railways of the country. At the same time, every protectionist organ in the country has doubtless been given the cue to work the disreputable racket for all it is worth.—Chicago News.

Time to Draw the Line.

Last year Cleveland's heroic veto alone stood between the depletion of the Treasury and the dependent pensions bill; this year the country looks to Congress to stand the brunt of the profligate scheme to distribute the surplus.

Never in the history of nations has there been such generosity shown to the defenders of their country as is exhibited in the pension legislation and pay-roll of the United States. The proverbial ingratitude of a republic has been grandly refuted. The annual sum paid for pensions in the United States last year nearly equaled the cost of the magnificent military establishment of Germany, which for the year 1886 was \$84,968,140. That our readers may have some idea of the generosity of the United States in the line of pensions, we invite their study of the following table of amounts paid out of the National Treasury for pensions from 1861 to 1887:

1862	\$852,170	1879	\$29,257,306
1863	1,018,513	1877	27,963,752
1864	4,85,474	1878	27,197,019
1865	16,34,021	1879	3,121,482
1866	15,60,540	1880	56,777,174
1867	20,94,552	1881	50,059,280
1868	23,782,387	1882	61,345,194
1869	28,476,622	1883	66,012,574
1870	23,140,02	1884	55,429,226
1871	31,4	1885	56,1,2,267
1872	28,533,4	1886	63,04,864
1873	21,337,427	1887	75,029,101
1874	29,456,210	Total	\$832,031,770

The estimated pension appropriation for the present year is \$80,000,000.

In the face of this showing the National Pension Committee of the Grand Army of the Republic has presented a bill to Congress calculated to lap up every surplus dollar in the treasury. It asks for an invalid pension of \$12 a month to all persons who served three months in the army or navy and were honorably discharged, no matter how their present disability was occasioned. It also has wide-open provisions for the pensioning of the widows and children after the date of the pensioner's death, without regard to the cause of the pensioner's death. An annual surplus of \$100,000,000 would vanish before such a ravenous bill as this, which is being urged by pension agents who are striving their utmost to disgust the people over the whole internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

But if Mr. Blaine were nearer the people and would wipe the protection film from his eyes, he would see that the appeal for relief from the internal-revenue tax on tobacco does not come from the consumers but from the manufacturers. The consumers of tobacco have witnessed a reduction in the tax of one-half within the last five years, but they have not been able to perceive a corresponding reduction in the price of the juicy plug or the fragrant cigar. The manufacturer has pocketed the internal revenue tax upon every plug of tobacco and every cigar.

SENATOR HAWLEY says: "It is not the fault of the Republicans that the taxes are so high, and that all this surplus has accumulated. Revenue measures must start in the House, and the Democrats have had the House ten out of twelve years."

The Senator is disingenuous. He knows that tariff reform every time has been beaten in the House by the Republicans and the handful of Randall Protectionists, who practically are Republicans on the tariff question; and that, if it had not been beaten there, it would have been beaten in the Republican Senate—and with his assistance, too.

OPINIONS OF THE MESSAGE.

Views of Senators and Congressmen

—Comments of Different Newspapers.

Republican, Democratic and Mugwump
Sentiment as to the Effect of the
Document.

CONGRESSIONAL OPINION.

Both Sides Pleased—Expressions of Sen-
ators and Representatives.

Both political parties express satisfaction with its utterances on the tariff. The Democrats are pleased with its bold declarations in favor of tariff revision and the reduction of customs duties, regarding its utterances as a platform upon which they can appeal to the country for the continuance of public confidence and support, while fully opposite reasons the Republicans profess to be pleased with it. Republican leaders say the message removes all doubt touching the attitude of the administration and the dominant party on the tariff question, clearly defines the issue between the two parties, and places the Democrats squarely in favor of a policy bordering on free trade and inimical to the general interests of the country. Senators Hiscott, of Evansville, and New York Republicans are content that the message insure a Republican victory in that State next fall, and Senator Sherman believes it will demoralize the Democratic party in Ohio. Mr. Randall would say nothing about the document until he had opportunity to give it careful reading and study, but his manner indicates that the message goes much farther in the direction of tariff reform than he expected. Judge Kelley regards it as a weak argument for break-down of the present tariff system, many of its sentences sounding like the frequent utterances of Mills and Morrison in the House and Beck in the Senate.

[Washington special to Chicago Tribune.]

In the House, after the reading of the message, leading Democrats expressed themselves pointedly as follows:

Mr. Mills said: "Good, elegant, it could not be better."

Mr. Springer said: "That is a good one. He hits the nail on the head every time. We have only one."

Mr. Townsend said: "Elegant, elegant. It beats them all. It could not be better. We are going to stand by him, and we are going to win."

Judge Seney, of Ohio, said, laconically: "Good."

Mr. Hemphill expressed satisfaction.

Mr. Randall declared that he had nothing to say on the subject at present. He was going to read the message again.

Mr. Bland said: "It's the best we ever had. I have not heard its equal since I have been in Congress."

On the Republican side Mr. McKinley said: "It is a splendid free-trade document. As good as it is written at the Cobden Club. Indeed, it could not be better if taken from some of the Cobden Club documents. I greet it with pleasure."

It is a one-sided and prejudiced discussion of financial theories," said Mr. Cannon, of Illinois. "It was not like anything we have ever had before us or will have again."