

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 pamphleteer 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:

Years 1850 to 1860
and 1860 to 1870.

Lines of progress.

	Population	29.2
Wealth	33.5	61.0
Foreign commerce, aggregate	120.6	45.6
Foreign commerce, per capita	131.0	45.6
Miles of railroad, aggregated	70.3	15.2
Miles of railroad, per capita	240.0	69.0
Capital in manufactures	150.0	34.0
Wages in manufactures, aggregate	90.0	66.0
Wages in manufactures, per hand	60.3	58.2
Products of manufactures	17.3	9.4
Value of farms	5.0	69.6
Value of farm tools and machinery	103.0	23.6
Value of live-stock on farms	62.0	27.7
Value of live-stock on farms	103.0	17.3

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 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 (underground) exported prior to that time, a period of seventy-one years, with the two whole decades since, and the last year:

Period.	Corn, bushels.	Wheat, bushels.
1780 to 1860—71 years	149,905,645	83,771,529
1860 to 1870—10 years	100,611,081	220,113,995
1870 to 1880—10 years	536,434,697	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 ground 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.	Wheat.
1850 to 1860—10 years	72.8 cents	\$1.39
1860 to 1870—10 years	61.6 cents	1.36
1870 to 1880—10 years	53.9 cents	1.24
1887—1 year	47.9 cents	.84

*Up to the war 85 per cent. of our wheat export was in the manufactured state—flour. In 1870 only 38 per cent. of it went abroad in that form. Our flour millers are certainly manufacturers, thus missed the cost of sending 78,000,000 bushels of wheat. Quite a state 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% 75%

Liverpool..... 65% 97%

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 to 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 per 100 yards.

In Switzerland, and may include Germany..... \$.44 to \$.49

In England..... .65

In America..... .80 to 1.12

Value of live-stock on farms

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0