

AN EDITOR'S ELOQUENCE

HON. HENRY WATSON'S GREAT
SPEECH AT DETROIT.

He Gives a Clinical Dissection of the
Republican Platform—Falsely Pretends
of the G. O. P. Shown Up in Burning Words
—An Earnest Appeal for the Reduction of
War Taxes.

Sensible men, surveying the state of affairs, may well ask about it, and ask themselves how we may best be saved from the mountain of war taxes on which we stand, in order to reach the dead level of a permanent and prosperous peace footing. There is no question now for this country so important as this. It is, indeed, the issue of the campaign, and is purely one of condition, and in no wise one of fact. Now that the lines of battle are fixed—fixed by the message of the President, fixed by the Mills bill and the debate in Congress, fixed by the St. Louis platform, and fixed by the acceptance of the President—it is purely immaterial what opinion gentlemen on either side may entertain touching the original principle of taxation. Mr. Blaine, for example, is opposed to the repeal of the whisky tax, while the Republican platform demands its repeal; yet Mr. Blaine supports without question the Republican tax. When it comes to doctrinal hairsplitting, there are differences as well as differences and degrees among the revenue reformers. But this is neither a doctrinal nor a personal campaign. This is a campaign of party forces and organized ideas. Every party must have a platform, and every platform must have a basis. The basis of the Republican platform is the tariff. It is too late for revision, it is too late for afterthoughts; the record is made up, and as our friend Senator Blackburn said on one occasion, "the record is a dead end, and he who doubts is damned." I am going to-night to take these two national platforms, to put them on the stand and to let them say how they stand upon this great issue. It seems to me we have been so assailed with being free-traders that we have quite forgotten to apply to their platform the same logical tests they have been allowed to apply to our own; I want to go over them specifically and see how they stand. You all know that the tariff is a tax levied by the government upon articles of foreign import to raise money for its own support. We have had high taxes and low taxes; we have had peace tariffs and war tariffs. The present tariff unites all the bad features of all the bad tariffs that ever preceded it. It is a peace tariff on a war basis. That is to say, though reconstructed in time of peace, it actually multiplied and augmented all the impositions put upon the country during a time of war. Those impositions were considered a great burden upon the patriotism of the people. They were confessedly made in response to the public exigency. Their authors prided when they made them that they should not outlast that exigency, and yet the only revenue they have had, and then at the hands of the Republicans, since the war has not only failed to reduce them but has actually increased them; so that now they are higher than they were when, as a measure of military necessity, they were created. Nor is this all, nor the worst of it, for their authors, recanting all their original pledges, now tell us that they are here forever, and that they shall never be revised except to be made not lower, but higher. And in proof of that I come without further apology to that fantastic ebullition of political misanthropy, that curious receptacle of dry bones of the dead languages, that antiquarian comic almanac and last chapter in the gospel, you know, the Republican platform. I have had a little experience with platform-making, and with the platform of my own party, and I know what it is to be suspected of being a little too honest and seeing a little too far ahead for the use of this world; but if I were a Republican and had written this platform of my friend McKinley, I would not be living now as he is to tell the tale. It is the most tedious and most irrelevant piece of jocosity, the most astonishing example of going back into the dark ages in quest of something without finding it, yet produced by the political annals of the country. Dr. Burchard's famous oration to Brother Blaine alone excepted. Perusing that platform, I am in a state of perpetual wonder how it happens that any man could have been so silly, so blind, because as a rule humor is clear-sighted and sensible. I say funny with perfect adroitness. It is funny in its errors, funny in its inconsistencies, funny in its falsehoods. A clever rascal said to me once, "I have never at least avoided the mistake of attributing the administration of Grover Cleveland on a series of specific points, each one of which is a direct and damaging indictment of antecedent Republican policies. But that is just the point. This platform does from first to last, and before I come to the main point, let me, for purposes of illustration, point you out a few of them. I will take them at random; it doesn't make much difference where you begin. For example, this platform says that the Republican party condemns the policy of the administration in its efforts to demote silver and favors the reduction of letter postage to one cent. Why, it was the Republican party that demoted silver. It was the Democratic party that re-monetized it. It is true that the policy of the Treasury under the present administration has been set against the continued coinage of the metal, and to that extent it has been overruled by the Democratic majority in Congress; but it is on a direct line with the policy of the Treasury under three Republican secretaries, including John Sherman. And that is the reason. I suppose, why the Republican platform denounces it. But letter postage, letter postage, cheaper postage reduced to one cent! The Republicans say they are in favor of that. Why, gentlemen, nearly a year before the adoption of this comic almanac, I mean this platform, nearly a year, Senator Beck, of Kentucky, introduced into the Republican Senate exactly such a message. It was referred by the Republicans of the Senate to the Republican Committee on Postoffice, and there it sweetly sleeps to-night. And it sleeps so soundly that the Kentucky Senator, Democrats and Scotchmen as he is, has not been strong enough to wake it up. Perhaps he will have better luck after the cows come home in November.

Well, next they demand the restoration of our mercantile marine. Who attempted it? When the Democratic party went out of power, after twenty-eight years of incumbency, the oceans of the world were white with American sails. There was not a port in Christendom which was not gladdened and made brighter by the stately emblem of the Republic, floating from a Yankee masthead. How stood the account after twenty-five years of Republican domination? A friend of mine who has just returned from an extensive tour in foreign lands—no Mr. Blaine—this friend of mine recently told me that the only American ship he found in all his travels was the rotten hulk of an old Confederate cruiser, stranded on the coast of Barbary, and used by the Arabs as a sort of what boat. But still the Republicans demand the restoration of our mercantile marine, annihilated by a quarter of a century of Republican policies.

Well, here is another good one. They say, "We declare our hostility to the introduction into this country of foreign contract labor." A self-accuser again. It was the Republican party that originated that debasing system. It was the Republican party that stuck to it like a brother. It was the Democratic party that forced the passage of laws restricting it. It is a Democratic administration which is enforcing those laws as they never were enforced by any Republican. It is a Democratic committee of Congress which is now going about the country investigating violations of the law, and taking to see what can be done to make it still more effective, and every man thus far in the foreign contract labor business thus far is howling for high tariff. But still this ostrich of a platform sticks its head behind the rock and denounces the introduction of foreign contract labor.

I think I will pass over. I will jump the references to the Monroe doctrine and the Mormons as hardly worth particular attention. As simple, jocosely foot-noted stuck in to fill out the page, and I will also jump the reference to the heathen Chinese. I am going to do that because the nomination of Harrison, China's own, meets the reference to the heathen Chinese. That nomination, it seems to me, sufficiently punishes that. I am going to jump these because I want to get as soon as I can to a clause which, in view of recent events, seems to me to rise to the dignity of what the boys used to call "A good joke on Schneider." Stand from under, gentlemen, while I read it: "We denounce the Democratic administration for its weak and unpatriotic treatment of the fishery question." How is that? High, my countrymen? Why, Grover Cleveland took the lion's tail and jerked it clean out of its socket, and he took that lion's tail and lashed the Republican Senate into kingdom come with it. But still the Republican "What is it?" denounces the administration for its weak and unpatriotic treatment of the fishery question,

Thus it is, gentlemen, that the Republican party is nothing if not a great warrior on paper. For a great many years it did not need any other oriflamme than the bloody shirt; but the bloody shirt seems somehow to have worn out, and won't serve its purpose any longer, and so it must get out another red rag and it finds this red rag in the British lion, which with one reach of his big, broad hand, Grover Cleveland snatched bald-headed, and ever since, these warriors of battles that were never fought, by them, have been running about, hither and thither, and wringing their hands, and asking one another if they had seen any stray lions lying about here. There used to be in the old Bowery Theater of the city of New York (there may be some middle-aged people in this very audience who will remember it, an actor by the name of Kirby. Kirby was the pride and glory of the Bowery. He had just one single act, but that act kept the Bowery Theater going season after season, year after year. Kirby wrapped the American flag around him, rushed down to the footlights, fired off two horse pistols, and died like a son of a gun. Poor Kirby actually died years ago. His bones, rest his soul, were carried to the public's field. All that is left behind him, of himself, his personal representative and residuary legatee, is the Republican party, and that is bound to the same destination.

I beg your pardon, gentlemen. I meant to stir up no such flood of levity as this. This is no laughing matter. Let us dry our eyes and come to the main point; let us come to the issue which divides the parties, as it appears in these two platforms. The Republican platform starts out with the declaration that "we are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection," and then all of a sudden it seems as though they had not done it enough and they reiterate that "the American system of protection must be maintained." Now, that means nothing at all, nothing whatever. It is no more an American system of protection than a Canadian system of protection, than a Russian system of protection,

those clauses of the bill which put wool on the free list, for its particular denunciation. Now, there is no feature of the measure proposed by the Democratic Ways and Means Committee which will better bear discussion than this one, and I propose to make a test case of it. I propose to meet it squarely. *Falsus in omni, falsus in omnia.* If the Republican platform breaks down here there is nothing to it anywhere, and there really is nothing to it anywhere. The whole Republican plan of battle in this campaign rests upon the sheersheet assumption, its right wing resting on Mr. Blaine, its left wing resting on free whisky, and nothing to sustain its center but the "fact" that Mr. Foster may be able to fry out of My Lord Carnegie and the rest of his ilk.

Well, they say in plain words: "We denounce the purpose of the Democrats to put wool on the free list." That is their sentiment in a nutshell. The wool duties at this moment, under the present tariff, range about 38.81. The Mills bill proposes to reduce them twenty per cent, or to 32.81, but they find this twenty per cent reduction is putting wool on the free list. Now, if the wool grower doesn't complain of that, what has the manufacturer to complain of? Now I don't hear of any conversion among the wool growers. All that I can hear of the wool growers is through protectionist attorneys whom they have not employed, and Republican newspapers which they don't read. It is the Republican manufacturer who thinks to score a point for his party by raising an outcry against free wool, but in this, as in all else, and like all his compatriots, he is thoroughly and absolutely inconsistent.

Away back in 1836, when the woolen schedules were first increased, the Wool Growers' Association of America, their national organization, through its Secretary, John L. Hays, sent a communication to Congress, and here is what they said then, and this is official and authentic: "The wool manufacturers of the country would prefer the total abolition of specific duties, provided they could get all their raw material free, and an actual net protection of twenty-five

who, if the Republicans control the next House, are permitted to bring in a tariff bill based upon as clear a statement as is contained in this platform. Now, let us see what this statement is. Let us see what they propose in lieu of the Mills bill. They start out by saying that the Republican party was induced to revise the tariff, and that in the first place it will take the tax of cigarettes and other forms of tobacco. Well, one of the objections to the Mills bill is that it does that. But the reason the Republicans give for it is one of the funniest things in that funny business they were at in making this platform. But they are in favor of taking the tax off cigarettes because it is a burden to agriculture. And what about the tax on pots and pans and plows and ever, thing else that enters into popular consumption?

They propose to take the tax off whisky and distilled spirits used in manufactures and arts. Then they propose to revise the customs duties so as to check imports, as though the present duties were not in all conscience high enough for protective purposes. And then, if there is any surplus left in the Treasury, they propose broadly to repeal the internal revenue taxes altogether. That means free whisky and dear blankets. That means free whisky and dear stockings. That means free whisky and dear everything.

How natural it was. How natural it was after constructing this scheme of free whisky and prohibitory duties that they should adopt the supplemental resolution declaring it as the opinion of the Republican party that the first concern of all good government is the virtue of the people and the purity of the home. And that they should declare that the Republican party sympathizes with all wise and well directed schemes for the propagation of virtue and morality. They said the sugar, and water the milk, and lard the butter, and everybody is invited to pray. "The devil was sick, the devil a saint would be; the devil got well, the devil a saint was he." It is hard to be serious, it is hard to be courteous, it is impossible to be respectful in the presence of such

THE TARIFF AND WAGES

IMPOSTS AID TRUSTS AND NOT THE WORKINGMEN.

The Opinions of a Political Man—He Favors the Mills Bill and Will Vote for Cleveland and Thurman—The Great Steel Trust.

[New York special to Chicago News.]

One of the best-known and most successful railroad contractors in America is C. W. Rutherford. He has built many miles of railroad and is largely interested in various industrial enterprises. He has been generally regarded as a Republican, but has shown a very marked respect for resident Cleveland. Your correspondent asked him what effect the election would have upon his business.

"None directly," he replied. "No matter who is elected President, the country will go right along just the same. But my business of railroad building is greatly affected by the more or less general prosperity and development of the country, and, as a matter of course, the cheaper railroads can be built the more there will be built. I am not a free-trader. Any man is a fool who is, but I'll tell you one thing—free trade wouldn't reduce wages in any line of business one cent. As it is now, I am protected in everything but in wages. Iron, lumber, and everything else that goes into the construction of railroads is protected, except labor. I may make, as I do, a contract for 1,000 laborers at so much a day, but there is nothing to protect me from them getting together and striking the very week they go to work for 25 cents a day more. I have often had to submit to it because they knew I had many contracts to fill at a specified time."

"Wages for labor is a question of supply and demand. If the tariff has anything to do with it, wages would be the same all over the country. As it is, I have paid common laborers in California \$5 and \$6 a day and at the same time had better men working for me in the East for \$1.25 a day. I tell you I know when I talk about labor in building railroads, and I know that even if we had free trade I couldn't get common labor any cheaper than I can get it now. But with a reduction of the tariff I could get everything else cheaper. I have been heavily interested in the manufacture of iron and am now, and I would, for the general good of the country, see a much greater reduction of wages in any line than the 60 cents which the Mills bill takes off. We still have \$3 a ton protection and it is more than we need. Not a cent of it goes into the hands of our laborers. We would have to pay them just as much as we do now if the tariff was all taken off."

"We can, in the southern part of the country, make iron just as good and cheaper than Scotch pig-iron can be made with the tariff price off. But no; that won't do for our manufacturers. They must make our people pay them the \$3 per ton to go into the hands of the few men who are in the trusts; whereas, if we would take off the duty on raw materials it would so much increase our markets that the additional business we would do would more than offset the very slight percentage of wages we pay our men made in the mills where the \$300.00 pig is made. Why, you take this steel trust. It is the biggest trust this country has ever had. Steel rails can now be made as cheap as iron rails were, and yet they put on \$17 duty, every dollar of which goes into the hands of the few men who make up the trust. Mr. Blaine's friend, Carnegie, isn't satisfied with that, but is even now trying to establish an international trust, so that, no matter what Congress may do, they can keep up the price of steel rails at the high rate. These people had better have a care. It isn't healthy when one man of a firm of four or five men can make a profit of \$1,500,000 in a year and then tell his employees that they must consent to a reduction of 15 per cent, in their wages or he will lock up his mills and go to his castle in Scotland, as Mr. Carnegie did."

"This \$17 a ton must be added to every ton of the millions of tons required to build the railroads of this country, and it is the people who have to pay for them. America makes probably two-thirds of the manufacturing implements of the world, and has the advantage of holding the patents on the inventions and the superior skill of its artisans; and she cannot then compete with England and other countries, make them at a profit, has to employ convict contract labor. At least one-half of the labor on the agricultural implements of the country is secured in the penitentiaries. Take off the duties which go into the pockets of these few men, his few associates, and you open the market to these manufacturers, and they can afford to hire free labor. It would be better to compete with the cheaper labor of England than with the convict labor of America. The first thing that wages paid in the protected industries are, purchasing power of the money considered, cheaper than they are in the same lines in England. The stone-masons, blacksmiths, brick-layers, carpenters, and others in the protected industries are the ones who get the high wages. It is in the protected blast-furnaces, woolen mills, and cotton mills where the lowest wages are paid. One of the largest cotton manufacturers in the country, over in Connecticut, and a Republican, told me the other day that with free wool America could pay the same wages it pays now and sell her carpets right in England, as better carpets are made here."

"The Republicans say our home market is large enough. I am not an old man, but I have suffered heavy losses from panics brought about by overproduction which would not have occurred if we had the markets of the world. The free raw materials provided for in the Mills bill would open for us. Business requires transportation. Commerce needs vessels. There is nothing, comparatively, but British flags flying down at the docks, simply because American commerce doesn't require the vessels. Carriers for these vessels have to be brought to them by railroads. I could well believe that Mr. Cleveland, if he were to receive from my interest in the iron business by the increase in my business of building railroads which would follow open markets."

"I don't need to refer to the surplus. The Republicans demanded a reduction in 1884. Now, Blaine, Carnegie & Co. don't want it reduced at their expense, but want it done by taking off the tax on whisky. That is a plan that may suit that way, but it doesn't suit me. I am disgusted, too, with this attempt to reduce the tariff, and I am by the false cry that their small wages will be made smaller when the very men who are doing it know better. A laborer may be fooled in that way, but it is not so with the mechanic, and I have reason to believe that Mr. Cleveland will get many a vote from the more intelligent mechanics than is now dreamed of. I shall vote for Cleveland, and I have a big notion to vote for Hill and the whole Democratic ticket on top of it."

ANOTHER OF INGALLS' LETTERS.

He Writes a Friend that the Mills Bill Will Be Attacked and Admits that the Tariff Ought to Be Revised.

[Kansas City special.]
The following letter from Senator John J. Ingalls, written to one of his constituents and vouched for as accurate, is published in the Kansas City Times:

"VICE PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER,
WASHINGTON, Sept. 6, 1888.
MY DEAR SIR: The Mills bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance, who will probably report an original bill. I have statute in the course of a few days. My own impression was that it would have been better to have gone to the country with the bill as it passed the House. The debate has been very able and public opinion has been crystallized. As it is, we will have to attack the Mills bill and defend our own. I agree with you in thinking the tariff needs revision, but the time is too short for intelligent action before a journey. Agricultural products are protected fully as much as those which are manufactured. Very truly yours,
JOHN J. INGALLS."

Free Raw Materials.

Give the American manufacturer his raw materials free of duty; give him the efficient machinery which his inventive genius can produce; give him the superior skill of our workmen, and he can do three things easily as he can roll off a log. 1. He can afford to pay high wages because his employees can accomplish more in eight hours than the same class anywhere else can accomplish in ten. 2. He can do a rushing, thriving business and clear handsome profits for himself, which is his right and his due. 3. He can take these goods, produced at high wages, and compete in London, Berlin, Paris, Madrid, India, China, Japan and South America with the cheapest wages and the longest hours that pauper labor ever dreamed of accepting or ever tried to starve on.—New York Herald.

I AM for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade.—James A. Garfield.



or a German, or a French, for all those countries are protection countries. Fifty years before free trade was seriously thought of in England it actually existed in America. Fifty years before Cobden and Peel carried their measures of free trade—I want to emphasize this statement—the Government of the United States, as Washington as President and Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury, proposed to institute free trade between England and the United States, and the offer was rejected by England. At the very moment when Mr. Clay gave the name of "American" to the system of protection proposed by him, the English tariff was higher than the American tariff, and England was more of a protection country than the United States. Mr. Clay himself pleaded first for three years, and afterward for nine years, as quite sufficient to develop certain infant industries, for whom exclusively he pleaded. There was no thought in those days of the wages of workingmen. All that was thought of was the development of our infant industries. There was no thought of protection except as a temporary policy. Never until this platform did any set of party leaders dare propose it as a principle, and in doing it now they go contrarywise to the utterances of all their own statesmen and all their own platforms, this one alone excepted. But their citation is as untruthful as their declaration, for in the next sentence they say that "The abandonment of this protective system has always been followed by the ruin and sheriff. Why, fellow-citizens, it never has been abandoned at all. We have had, as I said a while ago, high tariffs and low tariffs, war tariffs and peace tariffs, and the country has prospered under all of them and suffered under all of them. We have had good times and bad times under all our tariffs, but there has never been a tariff since the first one was created that did not contain protection and plenty of it. The greatest financial disaster the country ever knew, that of 1813, came when we had had the inestimable blessings of this high protective tariff for ten years. The highest high-water mark of national development and prosperity we have ever known was the period of the Democratic revenue tariff known as the "Walker tariff," extending from 1816 to 1833. And when this platform says, "That the departure from a protective system, which has never been abandoned at all, has been followed by general disaster to all interests, except those of the usurper and sheriff," it is an insult to popular intelligence, and flies directly in the face of history, both current and ancient. The clause that contains it is a falsehood, and it is only a mercy of God that there was no third, for that needs must have been a falsehood.

And now having fairly unlimbered itself, gotten its joints well oiled, this platform denounces the Mills bill as hostile to the general, agricultural, mechanical, and laboring interests of the country, and goes out of its way to specify cents." Now, that is what they proposed. This was in 1866—their raw material free and an actual net protection of twenty-five cents. There was at that time a ten cent internal revenue duty upon the made-up article, so in order to give them what they wanted Congress gave them thirty-five cents protection, instead of the twenty-five cents they demanded themselves, and ten cents to cover the internal revenue tax and a rebate to cover the raw material. Now, they have grown so fast that they tell us that the bill that proposed to give them so much more than they proposed to ask in 1866 is a free-trade measure and will ruin them if it becomes a law. Mind you, the interests I always have at- torneys at Washington, and soon after they got 31 per cent. protection they slipped under the Ways and Means Committee room and got the internal revenue tax taken off, leaving them really 31 per cent, instead of the 25 per cent. that they asked.

Now the Mills bill proposes to give them their raw material free and actually increase the duty on the made-up article from 35 cents to 40 cents, and they cry back "free trade."

Now, that is what they proposed. This was in 1866—their raw material free and an actual net protection of twenty-five cents. There was at that time a ten cent internal revenue duty upon the made-up article, so in order to give them what they wanted Congress gave them thirty-five cents protection, instead of the twenty-five cents they demanded themselves, and ten cents to cover the internal revenue tax and a rebate to cover the raw material. Now, they have grown so fast that they tell us that the bill that proposed to give them so much more than they proposed to ask in 1866 is a free-trade measure and will ruin them if it becomes a law. Mind you, the interests I always have at- torneys at Washington, and soon after they got 31 per cent. protection they slipped under the Ways and Means Committee room and got the internal revenue tax taken off, leaving them really 31 per cent, instead of the 25 per cent. that they asked.

Now the Mills bill proposes to give them their raw material free and actually increase the duty on the made-up article from 35 cents to 40 cents, and they cry back "free trade."

Now, that is what they proposed. This was in 1866—their raw material free and an actual net protection of twenty-five cents. There was at that time a ten cent internal revenue duty upon the made-up article, so in order to give them what they wanted Congress gave them thirty-five cents protection, instead of the twenty-five cents they demanded themselves, and ten cents to cover the internal revenue tax and a rebate to cover the raw material. Now, they have grown so fast that they tell us that the bill that proposed to give them so much more than they proposed to ask in 1866 is a free-trade measure and will ruin them if it becomes a law. Mind you, the interests I always have at- torneys at Washington, and soon after they got 31 per cent. protection they slipped under the Ways and Means Committee room and got the internal revenue tax taken off, leaving them really 31 per cent, instead of the 25 per cent. that they asked.

Now the Mills bill proposes to give them their raw material free and actually increase the duty on the made-up article from 35 cents to 40 cents, and they cry back "free trade."