

JOHN SHERMAN.

His War-Tariff Speech Answered
by the Chicago Tribune.

A Strong Editorial from the Leading
Republican Journal of the
Northwest.

The burden of John Sherman's speech on the tariff was, "No reduction of war-tax burdens on the people of the West; no relief to the plundered, robbed, overcharged Western farmers." To avoid any reduction of taxation Sherman has innumerable schemes for dissipating surplus revenues and making continued high taxation necessary—premature bond redemptions, wasteful expenditures for coast defenses, indiscriminate pensioning, refunding direct war taxes to the States, adoption of lavish river and harbor appropriations, the Blair humbug educational bill, etc., etc. Aiming to place every possible obstacle in the way of tariff reform and reduced taxation, Sherman made just such a speech as might have been expected from an Eastern Senator from a coddled, protected State and representing a constituency of trust monopolists and mill barons, but not one that does any credit to a Senator from the West. Don Cameron, of Pennsylvania; Senator McPherson, of New Jersey; Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Sam Randall or Fig-Iron Kelley, could not make any more ultra, never-let-up, tariff-robbing harangue. Sherman thinks he has found the straight path to the White House, but is only proving his demoralization through too great intimacy with Eastern coupon-clippers and monopolists.

Sherman's speech would have done well enough twenty-five years ago, when every cent that could be squeezed out of the people was needed, and when it sweetened the bitter dose to make them believe they were swallowing sugar-coated high-protection pills. High tariffs now stand on an entirely different footing. The Government is collecting 100 millions not needed for any justifiable or proper purpose, and the exaction ought to be thrown off in the interest particularly of Western farmers, who are working for a profit of 50 cents a day, and whose demand for reduced taxes must be heeded. These farmers know that their condition can be improved only by cutting down taxes and lessening the cost of living. They have to sell their surplus products in low free-trade markets, and they cannot go on buying their goods and manufactured articles at ultra high-protection prices. They submitted to this burden when the revenues were needed to carry on the war and to pay the war debt, but now that the tax levies are being piled up in useless hoards in the Treasury, all John Sherman's sophistry will not convince them that the blood-letting must go on.

Among his various schemes to perpetuate high taxation and tariff-protected monopolies, Sherman thinks none would be more effective than the repeal of the tobacco tax and the payment of a direct bounty to the Louisiana sugar-growers. But if a bounty is to be paid on sugar-growing, why not on wheat, corn, barley, oats and live stock? Who needs or deserves a bounty more than the hard-working and miserably paid Western farmers who sell their surplus productions in the free trade markets of Europe and buy all their goods, tools, machinery, clothing and necessities from American tariff-protected trusts and monopolies. Western farmers would be glad to have a bounty of 15 cents a bushel on corn, 25 cents a bushel on wheat, 10 cents a pound on butter, 2 cents on pork, and on other products in like measure, and if a Treasury bonus is to be paid any department of agriculture, why should it not go to that branch which has deserved the most, suffered longest, and received the least? Sherman loses his bearings altogether when he proposes to bonus the ex-rebels who are working the sugar plantations of Louisiana with negro labor and to leave Western farmers out in the cold. Surely this scheme is not in the interests of the negroes on the sugar plantations. They get no protection now, and would not under the bounty system, and would still be required to toil for a bare subsistence. If Sherman would look to the interest of the toiling blacks instead of their ex-rebel bosses on the sugar plantations he would advocate a far different policy. If the monopole plantations were broken up, and the land devoted to the more profitable culture of cotton, many of the blacks might get patches of land for themselves instead of depending for a livelihood on the beggarly wages paid by the plantation bosses. Nor need Sherman feel alarmed lest the removal of the sugar duty would give sugar-producing countries an opportunity to replace the levy with an export tax, and so transfer to their own coffers the revenues now paid into the United States Treasury while keeping up the price of sugar to consumers. That difficulty could be met by a discriminating tariff so arranged as to preserve the duties against any country that levied an export tax.

Senator Sherman revamps old protectionist dogmas with poor success. His claim that the wool duty has "encouraged the production of wool" is squarely and emphatically refuted by the record. The lowest price wool has reached in thirty years—25 cents—was under the high protective tariff, and when the duty was lowered in 1883 the price began to advance and rose steadily until it is now at 32 cents. Nor did the lessening of the duty lead to an increase of imports. In the four years preceding the reduction the imports of clothing wool were valued at \$16,772,000, and in the four years following at \$16,377,000, a decrease of \$400,000. Mr. Sherman's talents as a financier and statistician might perhaps be employed to advantage in showing how a lessening of the duty was followed by improved prices and a check of imports. He would hardly succeed better in the undertaking, however, than he does in renewing the claim that high tariffs are preserved solely to benefit labor and insure higher wages.

It is notorious that the worst paid labor in the United States is that employed in the high protected industries. Beggarly wages forced Americans out of the mills and factories of New England to give place to the Irish, whose discontent was expressed in strikes until they were made to give way to the wretched, superstitious, priest-ridden French-Canadian imported operatives, who can live on less and endure more than any other class the mill barons have yet found. Woman and child labor is the distinctive curse of the industries having the heaviest tariff protection. New

England has two strongly distinguished classes of population: tariff-protected monopolists and coupon-clippers so rich that they don't know how to spend their money, and the pauper factory hands who never get a cent's worth of protection out of the tariff. But while John Sherman wants the tariff preserved for the benefit of persons who never get a dime from it he hasn't even a crocodile tear for the underpaid Western farmer.

Not only in New England, but in every part of the country, is it true that low wages are paid in industries having the highest protection. The census of 1880 gives the following:

Unskilled labor in blast furnaces in Virginia, 82 cents per day; in Alabama, 98 cents; in Pennsylvania, \$1.00; and in Missouri, \$1.25.

The iron industry, having 50 to 90 per cent protection, makes the following showing of average wages for the year in different sections of the Union: Eastern States, \$417 per annum; Western, \$396; Pacific, \$354; Southern, \$304. The average wages varying from \$1 to \$1.33 per day.

The average weekly wages paid to workers in woolen goods (enjoying a protection of 70 per cent.) in Massachusetts in 1884 was \$6.90, or \$1.15 per day, while the average to workers in flax, linen, and hemp (30 to 40 per cent. protection) was only \$6 per week, or \$1 per day; to glass-workers (50 to 100 per cent. protection), \$10 per week, or \$1.66 per day; to cotton operatives (40 to 50 per cent. protection), \$7.68 per week, or \$1.28 per day; and to clothing operatives (70 per cent. protection), \$8.58 per week, or \$1.43 per day. The unprotected classes, especially the mechanics, do far better, the lowest grade of day-laborers averaging higher pay than the best class of skilled operatives in New England. So many of the latter are women and children, employed at starvation wages, that the average is reduced to a low figure. It should be noted also that the statistics we have given as to wages of protected classes in New England include in the averages the cost of superintendence, the figures in this respect being deceptive and probably intended to deceive.

Attributing to the tariff the prosperity flowing from the natural wealth of the country, the abundance and cheapness of rich land, and the invention of labor-saving machinery, John Sherman is unable to escape the fact that where protection is highest wages are relatively low and slow to rise. Necessarily it must be so. Ultra protectionism fosters monopoly and gives manufacturers power to squeeze both the laborer and the consumer. When not needed for purposes of revenue there can be no justification for duties so high that they exclude and prohibit foreign competition and offer home manufacturers a bribe to combine in pools and trusts to extort high prices, depress wages, and monopolize the market.

Senator Sherman took exceptions to the President's policy because he had, on what he (Mr. Sherman) regarded as a frivolous reason, refused his signature to the river and harbor bill, "which would have appropriated more than \$10,000,000 for necessary (?) public works," and by his veto of the dependent pension bill "he had withheld from Union soldiers appropriations made for their relief." President Cleveland vetoed the river and harbor bill because there were jobs and steals in it involving thousands upon thousands of dollars which he could not prevent without vetoing it entirely. The bill was full of these jobs, set up by local bosses and engineered by log-rolling Congressmen who were anxious to secure the influence of these bosses and to spend public money among their constituents, it is a matter of public notoriety that surveys of rivers and creeks have been ordered that could not be found by the surveyors. The history of Clark's Creek and Mingo Creek, alleged to be in South Carolina, whose existence was unknown to any person in that State, is too familiar to need repetition. It is notorious that the bill contained numerous similar steals and jobs for dredging and improving goose ponds and duck creeks, involving an immense amount of money. Would it not have been more statesmanlike for the Senator to have pointed out these steals, and, more than this, to have demanded that the President shall have the authority to veto items in such a bill just as the State authorities of New York, Pennsylvania and Illinois, and the Mayor of Chicago have, for the protection of taxpayers? The President took a justifiable position when he vetoed the bill, and the Senator's attack upon him was not well made.

The vetoing of extravagant river and harbor bills is not a distinctive Democratic policy. President Grant vetoed some of these bills, and President Arthur did the same. Has it come to this—that the Republican party must assume responsibility for all the swindling river and harbor grabs for years. The following figures are as nearly official as may be procured:

1-21	70c	1810	...50c	1836	...60c	1872	...50c
1825	60c	1811	...52c	1837	...60c	1873	...41c
1838	52c	1812	...48c	1838	...50c	1874	...39c
1827	44c	1843	...66c	1839	...60c	1875	...39c
1828	48c	1844	...50c	1860	...60c	1876	...35c
1829	55c	1845	...45c	1861	...47c	1877	...33c
1830	70c	1846	...50c	1862	...57c	1878	...31c
1831	75c	1847	...47c	1863	...70c	1879	...30c
1832	65c	1848	...45c	1864	...75c	1880	...30c
1833	65c	1849	...42c	1865	...75c	1881	...29c
1834	70c	1850	...47c	1866	...60c	1882	...25c
1835	65c	1851	...50c	1867	...61c	1883	...25c
1836	70c	1852	...50c	1868	...43c	1884	...26c
1837	70c	1853	...60c	1869	...40c	1885	...27c
1838	55c	1854	...57c	1870	...37c	1886	...32c
1839	60c	1855	...52c	1871	...46c	1887	...32c

This shows the price of wool under all the tariff systems we have had in this country, and explodes the fallacy of "protection." The highest and best price ever obtained for wool was previous to the 1867. With that tariff came a decline which ran down to 25 cents in 1883, when a portion of the tariff was removed, since when prices have improved.

"A TARIFF-CURSED STATE."

What the Michigan Farmers Pay for "Protection."

Editor of the New York Times.

You published a few days ago statistics furnished by the Commissioner of Labor, showing the extent to which, the farms of Michigan are mortgaged. The statistics are misleading for many reasons, one of which is that they must be obtained mainly from public records, and these for the most part show only the original amounts, without the payments that may have been made. Then it often happens that mortgages are paid in full and carelessly left un-discharged of record. From somewhat extended observation I am led to the conclusion that the farms of Michigan are on the average less burdened by debt than those of some other Northwestern States.

Michigan, however, is a tariff-cursed State, and if its farmers once awake to the fact of their burdens from oppressive taxation they will insist upon some relief. The tariff on lumber is peculiarly severe upon them; nearly every farmer in Michigan has

paid contribution to the pine-land barons for the privilege of building a house to shelter his family and barns for his grain and stock. There never was a more indefensible duty than that imposed upon lumber; it operates as a bounty for the speedy destruction of Michigan forests, and the payment of the bounty must be shared in by every man who makes use of a pine stick or board for any purpose of comfort or industry. A few men, by means of the lumber duty, become rapidly enormously rich; that is to say, they are enabled to add to profits that would otherwise be very large a further sum equal to the duty which the Government imposes for their benefit. And whoever has observed the run of politics in Michigan of late can not fail to have noticed how these very rich men, who have little besides their wealth to give them importance, aspire to and find means of obtaining the chief political positions. For the lumber tax there is not even the excuse that it benefits American labor; for the Michigan woods and saw-mills are full of Canadian workmen, who come for the busy season, and bear away their earnings to spend elsewhere. If the taking off the duty were to result in importations of lumber from Canada it would be all the better for Michigan, not only because the price of lumber would be brought to more reasonable figures, but because the forests of Michigan, which constitute a large part of its natural wealth, would be dealt with more prudently and with more regard for the future. The motto with the lumberman now is, "Let me be quickly rich," and he leaves behind him desolation.

But the war tariff, which has been suffered to exist so long after the need had ceased, is a fraud in every aspect in which it may be viewed. It is amusing that the people of Michigan can look upon it as a scheme for the protection of industry. There are some interests in Michigan which are benefited by it, but they are not numerous, and do not embrace large numbers of persons. All small industries are oppressed by the tariff. The tax which the small manufacturer or mechanic pays upon the material he works up is in great many cases sufficient to render profit impossible.

I have under my eye at this moment the following illustration of the working of "protection to American industry." Fifteen years ago five neighbors put \$20,000 each into the manufacture of certain tools. They were tools of a kind never imported, and the tariff could be to them of no benefit. The chief materials required were wood, iron, and other metals, and the working them up required labor of unusual skill. For ten years, though they kept steadily at work with a large force, they made nothing. Since then they have been enabled by their earnings to increase their plant considerably, though they have paid no dividend. If these men could have been relieved from the payment of any tax for the protection of American industry, and at the same time could have sold their tools at the price they actually received, they might easily have taken in annual dividends of ten per cent on their investment.

What is true of them is true of all the small industries of the country. They bear the burden of protection while others reap the profits. The interests which, if any do, need protection are interests which existing tariff oppresses.

A CITIZEN OF MICHIGAN.

FIGURES THAT DO NOT LIE.

Prices of Wool Under Different Tariffs as a Test of Protection.

[Columbus (Ohio) cor. New York World.]

Columbus Delano, ex-Secretary of the Interior and Chairman of the Republican annex known as the National Wool-Growers' Association, as heretofore reported, has sent out an "appeal" from this city urging the farmers and "flockmasters" of the country to unite against a reduction of tax burdens, and telling them that the slight reduction on wool made in 1883 has well-nigh destroyed the wool industry of the country and put prices at a figure ruinously low. He insists on a restoration of the tariff of 1867 as the only thing that will restore prices and stimulate production. This "appeal" was framed in the Neil House, in this city, by Mr. Delano and George L. Converse, the gentleman on whose motion the enacting clause of the Morrison bill was stricken out, and for which act his constituents retired him to private life with rare unanimity. This "appeal" is one of the preliminaries to Mr. Delano's candidacy for Congress next year on the Republican ticket.

The best possible answer to this misleading document is to take the average price of wool at Boston, the controlling wool market of the United States, for a series of years. The following figures are as nearly official as may be procured:

1-21	70c	1810	...50c	1836	...60c	1872	...50c
1825	60c	1811	...52c	1837	...60c	1873	...41c
1838	52c	1812	...48c	1838	...50c	1874	...39c
1827	44c	1843	...66c	1839	...60c	1875	...39c
1828	48c	1844	...50c	1860	...60c	1876	...35c
1829	55c	1845	...45c	1861	...47c	1877	...33c
1830	70c	1846	...50c	1862	...57c	1878	...31c
1831	75c	1847	...47c	1863	...70c	1879	...30c
1832	65c	1848	...45c	1864	...75c	1880	...30c
1833	65c	1849	...42c	1865	...75c	1881	...29c
1834	70c	1850	...47c	1866	...60c	1882	...25c
1835	65c	1851	...50c	1867	...61c	1883	...25c
1836	70c	1852	...50c	1868	...43c	1884	...26c
1837	70c	1853	...60c	1869	...40c	1885	...27c
1838	55c	1854	...57c	1870	...37c	1886	...32c
1839	60c	1855	...52c	1871	...46c	1887	...32c

This shows the price of wool under all the tariff systems we have had in this country, and explodes the fallacy of "protection." The highest and best price ever obtained for wool was previous to the 1867. With that tariff came a decline which ran down to 25 cents in 1883, when a portion of the tariff was removed, since when prices have improved.

The Blessed Tariff on Wool.

Philadelphia Record: In 1867, when the high wool tariff went into effect, there were 5,117,148 sheep in the State of New York. Under the prostrating policy of taxing imported wools the number of sheep in that State has been reduced to 1,579,866, and the price of wool is lower than it has been in forty years.

Bad Effects of the Tariff.

Louisville Courier-Journal: One of the worst things about the dishonest tariff is its tendency to the production of inferior articles. With no competition but that at home, our progress must necessarily be slow. It is an insignificant nation that cannot stand up and take its chances with the world.

An Element of Corruption.

There is no element in the politics of this country so corrupt and so corrupting as the influence of the favoritism in legislation.

called the "protective" tariff.—New York Times.