

TARIFF FACTS.

'Shameful Decline of Our American Shipping and Its Cause.

Some High-Tariff Fallacies Punctured by the Cold Facts and Figures.

(Extracts from "Tariff Chats," by Henry J. Philpott, of Des Moines, Ia.)

I might fill a large volume with statistics to show that we do not owe our high wages, or any of the other good things of this life, to the tariff lobby, but I have condensed a volume of statistics into one very little table, which Prof. Perry, of Williams College, has done me the honor to put into the last edition of his "Political Economy," which, by the way, is a standard text-book on that subject in American schools and colleges.

By way of preface to this table, which answers every claim of the tariff trustees, let me explain a little. Every protectionist orator and pamphlet tells you that this country has tried free trade, and that it always worked disastrously. Particularly he calls your attention to the bad results of the low-tariff period just before the war. He says all the prosperity of the country has been since then. I concluded to investigate that matter thoroughly. I used only official documents, except "Poor's Railroad Manual," which is the only recognized authority on that subject. I found the rate per cent, of increase from 1850 to 1860, under low tariff, and the average rate for each of the two ten-year periods since then:

Lines of progress.	Low tariff, 1850 to 1860.	Low tariff, 1860 to 1870.	Low tariff, 1870 to 1880.	High tariff, 1880 to 1890.
Population	35.5	36.2	36.2	36.2
Wealth	126.6	126.6	126.6	126.6
Foreign commerce, aggregate	131.0	131.0	131.0	131.0
Foreign commerce, per capita	70.3	70.3	70.3	70.3
Miles of railroad, aggregate	210.0	210.0	210.0	210.0
Miles of railroad, per capita	150.0	150.0	150.0	150.0
Capital in manufactures	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0
Wages in manufactures, aggregate	60.3	60.3	60.3	60.3
Wages in manufactures, per hand	17.3	17.3	17.3	17.3
Products of manufactures	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Value of farms	103.0	103.0	103.0	103.0
Value of farm tools and machinery	62.0	62.0	62.0	62.0
Value of live-stock on farms	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

One important industry had to be left out of the above table. Before the war our shipping was second only to agriculture in the sisterhood of our industries. Three-fourths of our foreign trade was carried in our own ships, and even this occupied but half of them, the other half being scattered over the whole world, bearing our glorious ensign of liberty everywhere and carrying a trade that was wholly foreign. That industry must be left out of the table because the last two decades show no increase at all, but a most startling and shameful decline. The old excuse was Confederate piracy. But my old neighbor, Iowa's first Republican Governor and second Republican Senator, James W. Grimes, always a persistent foe to protection, when he was Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, replied to this excuse:

Confederate piracy did not destroy our merchant marine. The privateers who have sunk the second commercial navy of the world sit around me in this Senate. The means they have used may be found in that protective policy which deserves to be called a "war measure," since it has wrought in our shipping such destruction as no enemy has ever inflicted, but the worst enemy would desire.

Last year, 1887, 14 1/2 per cent, of our foreign trade was carried in American vessels.

THE FARMER'S MARKET.

Let us take, for instance, the "facts" manufactured for the farmer's consumption. He is told that whatever home market he has he owes to the tariff, and that as a result of the tariff he sells at home what his fathers had to ship across the ocean. In other words, he now has a home market—as if Pennsylvania and Massachusetts were a home market for the Kansas farmer! But even if it were, the Kansas farmer is more dependent on the foreign market than ever, as I shall proceed to show. Our Government, ever since it was organized, has kept a record of the amount of wheat, corn, cotton and provisions exported to foreign markets. If the tariff trustees are really keeping their promise to furnish us a home market for these products the Government reports ought to show a steady decline of exports and a steady rise of prices. Now, let us see what they do show. Our lobby tariff was adopted soon after 1860. Here is a comparison of all the corn and wheat (unground) exported prior to that time, a period of seventy-one years, with the two whole decades since, and the last year:

Period.	Corn.	Wheat.
1789 to 1860—71 years	149,905,645	80,771,929
1860 to 1870—10 years	100,611,081	220,115,995
1870 to 1880—10 years	536,431,697	667,435,801
1887—1 year	40,307,252	101,971,949

We have exported more corn in the last four years, more wheat and flour* in the last six years, and more unground wheat in the last year than we did from the adoption of the Constitution in 1789 up to the adoption of our present system of taxation in 1862. We have exported more pounds of bacon and hams in the last fifteen months than our fathers did from the settlement of Jamestown in 1607 to the bombardment of Fort Sumter in 1861. If that is not a startling increase in our dependence on foreign markets for these farm products, I need enlightenment. Watch the tariff mendicant right here and see if he doesn't turn round now and claim that it is the foreign market, and not, as he said a minute ago, the home market, that his blessed system of one-sided taxation has built up. When he has made that claim, ask him if he desires also to claim the credit for the following apparent decline of export prices, as returned by the Government:

Period.	Corn.	Wheat.
1860 to 1870—10 years	72.8 cents	\$1.39
1870 to 1880—10 years	61.6 cents	1.36
1880 to 1887—7 years	63.9 cents	1.34
1887—1 year	47.9 cents	.94

*Up to the war 85 per cent. of our wheat export was in the manufactured state—flour. In 1887 only 93 per cent. of it went abroad in that form. Our millers, who are certainly manufacturers, thus missed the job of grinding 78,000,000 bushels of wheat. Quite an item, is it not? And the millers are taxed on their lumber machinery, mill-stones and bolting-cloths. Half a dozen manufacturers are injured where one is helped, if, indeed, any are helped, in a broad national sense, by the tariff.

A decline of one-third in the price of both wheat and corn from the average of the ten years before the tariff to the average of last year. How will the farmers like this when they find it out?

And how do American prices of these products compare with foreign prices today? If the tariff has "built up" a home market for the farmer, as it has by force of law "built up" a home market for the protected classes, corn and wheat ought to be higher in America than in England, as I have shown by market quotations that protected iron and steel are higher. Let us try the market quotations on corn and wheat for Feb. 14, 1888:

	Corn.	Wheat.
Chicago	.46 1/2	.75 1/2
Liverpool	.65	.97 1/2

Liverpool is 25 per cent. higher on wheat and 40 on corn. And this after our people have paid an average of at least \$500,000,000 for twenty years for a home market, whose sole purpose could only be to make corn and wheat worth as much in Chicago as in Liverpool.

The above are Chicago prices. The prices the farmers actually get are much less—say from 40 or 50 to 75, or 80 per cent. of Liverpool quotations, according to the location and the bulkiness of the product. Take it all over the regions where the exported surplus is raised, including cotton and all, it is quite within the bounds of reason to say that Liverpool is at least 50 per cent. higher than the original American market where the farmer sells.

THE LABORER'S HIRE.

That settles the labor question. Cotton, breadstuffs, and provisions are the farmer's wages—not his day wages, but his piece wages. They are all cheaper here than in England. Work by the piece is therefore cheaper here than in England for half the workers. Such being the case, if their work is higher by the day, the fact must be attributed to something besides the tariff.

Yes, and most of the other half of the people work cheaper by the piece than they do in England. Especially is this true in manufactures. Our manufacturers as a whole class have as great advantages over any other country as the farmers have. I have already called attention to these advantages. The result is that American manufacturers get their work done for less labor expense than those of any country in the world. Here is a little table worked out by our Consul at Tunstall, Mr. J. Schoenhof, showing the daily wages and wages per yard of cotton-mill operators in three countries.

	Daily wages.	Wages per 100 yards.
In Switzerland, and may include Germany	\$.44 to \$.49	\$.60
In England	.65	.55
In America	.80 to 1.12	.40

So the pauper labor of Europe is not so cheap to the man who buys it and sells its products as American labor is. Mr. J. B. Sargent, of New Haven, the most extensive hardware manufacturer in America, has told me over and over again that the same is true in his business, and, as he believes, in the great majority of American manufactures. This is one method of proof that it is not the workingman who gets the benefit of the tariff. He would be a pauper if he did, but he doesn't. The tariff pauper is the mill-owner. He owns the goods when they are made. He sells them. He pockets the proceeds. He imports laborers, free of duty. He joins a trust, closes his mill half the year, gets a dividend for lying idle and "limiting production," and turns his hands into the street to lie idle without a dividend and without wages.

Wages are lower in the protected than in the unprotected industries, and the workmen are more generally foreigners and treated worse. Many of them are to all intents and purposes bought by the ship-load, like slaves, in Europe. Of the 340,854 persons engaged in strikes last year 112,317, or about one-third, were in Pennsylvania, the most highly protected of all the States. There were half as many strikes in Pennsylvania as in all the rest of the country together.

In 1880 the trustees placarded every workshop in the country with a comparison of wages in thirteen occupations between different European countries, New York City, and Chicago. This was not a fair comparison, because the United States census of manufactures shows that wages are 24 per cent. higher in New York City than in the country as a whole. Without making any allowance for this, and averaging the whole thirteen occupations, we have on the trustees' own authority:

Germany—per week	\$ 3.64
England	7.69
New York	12.38
England higher than Germany 111 per cent.	
New York higher than England 61 per cent.	

Nearly double the relative difference between England and Germany as between New York and England, though Germany protects and England admits German goods free of duty. Our census of 1880 shows:

WAGES IN WOOLEN MANUFACTURES.	
Ohio—yearly	\$ 196
Connecticut	335
Connecticut higher than Ohio 70 per cent.	

WAGES IN COTTON MANUFACTURES.

North Carolina—yearly	\$ 135
New Jersey	253
New Jersey higher than North Carolina 88 per cent.	

A greater relative difference in both cases than even a red-hot protectionist campaign card claimed between New York City and England. If the latter difference is caused by the tariff what, pray, has created the others? While the trustees were at it they ought to have done a smoother job of wage-raising—or deception.

THE PROTECTION OF MONOPOLY.

Some Startling Statistics Furnished by Senator Colquitt of Georgia.

In a speech before the Senate of the United States last week, Senator Colquitt of Georgia submitted the following:

We should have a table showing in tabulated form all the details and items, the relative consumption of dutiable goods, imported and domestic, the prices abroad and at home, and the difference of cost. The biggest department of the Government might well be devoted to information on the subject of the costliest work of the Government—the protection of monopoly. What if it should cost more than the census, more than the collection of taxes? But it would cost little. The tribute is vastly more important than the taxes. It is levied year by year. An estimate will be worth its cost a hundred fold, as it may save in one year the cost of a hundred.

Such an estimate, in considerable detail, for the year 1882, was made by the Hon. William M. Springer and published in the *North American Review* of June, 1883. Fulfilling the neglected duty of Government, with intelligent and patriotic interest, he employed an expert for some months

in compiling the information embodied in the table hereto appended, which he derived from the reports of the census, the Statistical Bureau, etc., and from the best financial sources, with correspondence and personal interviews. The table shows the tribute paid by class to class. It is a work of great labor and value. The total tribute, according to his estimate, was \$556,000,000; the increased price was about 22 per cent., which is about half the average rate of duty. This does not include waste, enhanced price of neglected natural industries, or other losses occasioned by an unnatural system. Higher estimates are strongly endorsed by various political economists. We have taken the lowest estimate as a basis.

Amount of incidental taxes annually imposed on the people of the United States in the increased cost of home products by reason of discriminating duties on imported articles of like character; value of such home products; wages and number of hands employed, and imports and duties received thereon for the year 1882:

Articles affected by the tariff.	Value received.	Duty received.	Average rate, per cent.
Chemical products	\$21,517,109	\$6,719,521	31.23
Metals—iron and steel and all metal manufactures	10,529,043	6,060,207	57.56
Woods and wooden wares	74,427,988	30,583,985	41.09
Wool and woolen goods	6,454,327	18,393,581	285.37
Wool and woolen goods	94,940,397	40,210,573	42.35
Cotton and cotton goods	8,383,812	13,821,121	164.85
Wool and woolen goods	33,778,076	9,944,652	29.32
Wool and woolen goods	47,679,502	22,652,490	47.52
Wool and woolen goods	38,532,473	22,652,490	58.77
Wool and woolen goods	62,410,690	17,722,269	27.65
Wool and woolen goods	\$23,172,335	\$19,464,788	84.00

Value of home products, census year, 1880.	Average number of hands employed. Boys under 16 and girls under 15 counted as one-half a hand.	Total amount in wages during the year.	Estimated rate of increase and decrease, per cent.
\$1,377,324	28,028	\$11,940,704	23
\$1,682,500	30,674	\$13,610,403	20
\$2,400,592	40,000	\$12,618,101	20
\$3,193,460	50,000	\$13,910,692	20
\$4,553,460	60,000	\$14,789,353	20
\$5,933,384	70,000	\$15,668,014	20
\$7,353,384	80,000	\$16,546,675	20
\$8,773,384	90,000	\$17,425,336	20
\$10,193,384	100,000	\$18,304,000	20
\$11,613,384	110,000	\$19,182,660	20
\$13,033,384	120,000	\$20,061,320	20
\$14,453,384	130,000	\$20,940,000	20
\$15,873,384	140,000	\$21,818,680	20
\$17,293,384	150,000	\$22,697,360	20
\$18,713,384	160,000	\$23,576,040	20
\$20,133,384	170,000	\$24,454,720	20
\$21,553,384	180,000	\$25,333,400	20
\$22,973,384	190,000	\$26,212,080	20
\$24,393,384	200,000	\$27,090,760	20
\$25,813,384	210,000	\$27,969,440	20
\$27,233,384	220,000	\$28,848,120	20
\$28,653,384	230,000	\$29,726,800	20
\$30,073,384	240,000	\$30,605,480	20
\$31,493,384	250,000	\$31,484,160	20
\$32,913,384	260,000	\$32,362,840	20
\$34,333,384	270,000	\$33,241,520	20
\$35,753,384	280,000	\$34,120,200	20
\$37,173,384	290,000	\$35,000,000	20
\$38,593,384	300,000	\$35,880,000	20
\$40,013,384	310,000	\$36,760,000	20
\$41,433,384	320,000	\$37,640,000	20
\$42,853,384	330,000	\$38,520,000	20
\$44,273,384	340,000	\$39,400,000	20
\$45,693,384	350,000	\$40,280,000	20
\$47,113,384	360,000	\$41,160,000	20
\$48,533,384	370,000	\$42,040,000	20
\$49,953,384	380,000	\$42,920,000	20
\$51,373,384	390,000	\$43,800,000	20
\$52,793,384	400,000	\$44,680,000	20
\$54,213,384	410,000	\$45,560,000	20
\$55,633,384	420,000	\$46,440,000	20
\$57,053,384	430,000	\$47,320,000	20
\$58,473,384	440,000	\$48,200,000	20
\$59,893,384	450,000	\$49,080,000	20
\$61,313,384	460,000	\$49,960,000	20
\$62,733,384	470,000	\$50,840,000	20
\$64,153,384	480,000	\$51,720,000	20
\$65,573,384	490,000	\$52,600,000	20
\$66,993,384	500,000	\$53,480,000	20
\$68,413,384	510,000	\$54,360,000	20
\$69,833,384	520,000	\$55,240,000	20
\$71,253,384	530,000	\$56,120,000	20
\$72,673,384	540,000	\$57,000,000	20
\$74,093,384	550,000	\$57,880,000	20
\$75,513,384	560,000	\$58,760,000	20
\$76,933,384	570,000	\$59,640,000	20
\$78,353,384	580,000	\$60,520,000	20
\$79,773,384	590,000	\$61,400,000	20
\$81,193,384	600,000	\$62,280,000	20
\$82,613,384	610,000	\$63,160,000	20
\$84,033,384	620,000	\$64,040,000	20
\$85,453,384	630,000	\$64,920,000	20
\$86,873,384	640,000	\$65,800,000	20
\$88,293,384	650,000	\$66,680,000	20
\$89,713,384	660,000	\$67,560,000	20
\$91,133,384	670,000	\$68,440,000	20
\$92,553,384	680,000	\$69,320,000	20
\$93,973,384	690,000	\$70,200,000	20
\$95,393,384	700,000	\$71,080,000	20
\$96,813,384	710,000	\$71,960,000	20
\$98,233,384	720,000	\$72,840,000	20
\$99,653,384	730,000	\$73,720,000	20
\$101,073,384	740,000	\$74,600,000	20
\$102,493,384	750,000	\$75,480,000	20
\$103,913,384	760,000	\$76,360,000	20
\$105,333,384	770,000	\$77,240,000	20
\$106,753,384	780,000	\$78,120,000	20
\$108,173,384	790,000	\$79,000,000	20
\$109,593,384	800,000	\$79,880,000	20
\$111,013,384	810,000	\$80,760,000	20
\$112,433,384	820,000	\$81,640,000	20
\$113,853,384	830,000	\$82,520,000	20
\$115,273,384	840,000	\$83,400,000	20
\$116,693,384	850,000	\$84,280,000	20
\$118,113,384	860,000	\$85,160,000	20
\$119,533,384	870,000	\$86,040,000	20
\$120,953,384	880,000	\$86,920,000	20
\$122,373,384	890,000	\$87,800,000	20
\$123,793,384	900,000	\$88,680,000	20
\$125,213,384	910,000	\$89,560,000	20
\$126,633,384	920,000	\$90,440,000	20
\$128,053,384	930,000	\$91,320,000	20
\$129,473,384	940,000	\$92,200,000	20
\$130,893,384	950,000	\$93,080,000	20
\$132,313,384	960,000	\$93,960,000	20
\$133,733,384	970,000	\$94,840,000	20
\$135,153,384	980,000	\$95,720,000	20
\$136,573,384	990,000	\$96,600,000	20
\$137,993,384	1,000,000	\$97,480,000	20

NOTE.—Planters' product for 1880 was: Sugar, 196,759,200 pounds; molasses, 16,573,273 gallons. Number and wages of laborers not stated.

THE TARIFF IN ILLINOIS.

Some Surprising Facts Learned by the Chicago Times Correspondents.

(Chicago special.)

The Chicago Times recently took measures to sound the farmers of Illinois on the subject