

## TEARING THE TARIFF.

JAMES H. WALKER'S VIEWS ON THE  
M'KINLEY BILL.

The Well-Known Chicago Dry-Goods Merchant Arraigns the Ohio Protection Tinker—He Says Kansas Is Opening Her Eyes to New Convictions.

(From the Chicago Herald.)  
James H. Walker, the head of the big Chicago dry-goods house bearing his name, is the writer of the following interesting letter on the tariff. It was written in reply to Capt. B. Rockwell of Junction City, Kan., and its opening sentences tell in stronger language than words sometimes, express themselves the story of how light is dawning upon Kansas and the West. Mr. Walker's letter, or rather arraignment of the McKinley bill, is as follows:

I am sorry to hear that the citizens of Kansas are experiencing so little prosperity in their business affairs. Your conviction that the tariff is largely responsible for their straitened condition is undoubtedly correct. The tariff is the question of the hour and is assuming an importance little suspected by the majority of the citizens of this country. It is scarcely within the scope of a letter to discuss the "pros and cons" of this subject.

The venerable sophistries of protectionists have been current so long that they are reputably through age, and to the thoughts have the permanence of truth. With touching credulity far men has accepted the right of possible tax to his greatest benefit, and as the basis of our national prosperity. The present tariff, originally for war purposes, was loyally accepted by the people. So long as wheat remained above a dollar it was not severely felt, but with wheat at 78 cents in Chicago it has become a burden too intolerable to be borne, and the general conditions of the country are crying aloud for relief. The farmer, knowing that the most bountiful crops which ever smiled upon this country are producing him no net profit, is casting about for some alleviation. He feels that what he buys costs him too much, and believing that his local merchants exact too large a profit, is organizing "farmers' associations" in various parts of the country, hoping thereby to purchase his supplies at a smaller percentage of what is required by the merchants. This, however, will not meet the difficulty. The merchants' profits are none too large. The trouble is that, on account of being so heavily taxed, the goods originally cost the merchant too much.

The farmer has long been led to believe that the present exorbitant tariff is for the benefit of American labor, in order to enable it to get high wages, and thereby create a good home market for the products of the farm. A little investigation will prove to you that the operatives in the mills of the protected industries get far less wages than the employees of the unprotected industries, and the highest scales of wages and salaries in this country are those trades, professions and occupations which are not protected in any manner whatever. The mercantile clerks of this country get the highest salaries in the world. The carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, locksmiths, and all the mechanics engaged in the local industries which exist in our towns and villages get far higher wages than operatives in the mills, and much higher than similar workers in any part of the world. Our farmers are not protected in any sense of the term, and yet the farm laborer is better paid in this country than in any other. These facts seem to prove that high wages depend upon conditions rather than on protective policy. The benefits of protective law do not over 10 per cent. of the whole population. The other 90 to 95 per cent. pay enormous taxes for the enrichment of that 5 to 10 per cent. and get nothing in return.

Does your community know that the tariff tax on dry goods, such as dress goods, farmer's satin, cashmores, henriettes and shawls, will average 75 per cent. at the port of entry and nearly 100 per cent. by the time they reach the consumer?

Does your community know that there is a bill now being considered by Congress which is called a revised tariff bill?

The country at large imagines that revision of the tariff will reduce the production of the tariff. The facts are that as far as dry goods are concerned it means a still further increase of the tariff of from 5 to 12 per cent.

Does your community know that organized manufacturers are in Washington at present urging the passage of this enormous additional tariff on top of the tariff incredibly large already?

Does your community know that the passage of this bill means that many dry goods when they reach the consumer will cost exactly double what they ought to cost, or double what they would cost if this tariff did not exist?

Our dry goods pay a duty at the port of entry of 70 per cent. Add the import and the importer and retailer to the duty, say 25 per cent. more, and when they reach the consumer the tax is equal to 97 per cent. The bill now in Congress proposes to make this duty about 10 per cent. more, making the tax 110 per cent.

Fancy dannels for lawn tennis suits, waists, and shirts now pay a duty of 75 per cent. With the importers' and retailers' profits added, 100 per cent. Congress proposes to increase the duty by 33 1/3 per cent., making the tariff on those goods 133 per cent.

Silk-warp Henriettes now pay 90 per cent. It is now proposed to increase the duty to 90 or 100 per cent.

Woolen shawls now pay 80 per cent. It is now proposed to increase the duty to 90 or 100 per cent.

Is it just for any class of American citizens to receive a bounty of 100 per cent for doing business when 95 per cent of our citizens receive no bounty at all? Does not this favor of discrimination in favor of a few against the many, and does it not look very much like class legislation in favor of a privileged minority? Our agriculturists sell what they produce in the markets of the world, and the prices which the foreigner is willing to give for what we export makes the market prices for what is consumed at home.

The following are among the very large list of articles which are heavily taxed by the tariff and which are not produced in this country, never have been produced, and possibly never will be produced, because climate and other conditions prevent:

Linen goods of all classes (except common crash) pay 33 per cent, and when they reach the consumer the tax is 45 per cent. The present bill before Congress proposes to increase this tax 5 per cent. more.

Linen handkerchiefs, which are not and never have been produced in this country, pay 35 per cent. at the port of entry, or 44 per cent. when sold to the consumer.

Woolen coverings, which are not produced in this country, pay 50 per cent. and in the consumer's hands this tax is increased to 65 per cent. by the intermediate profits as previously stated.

Embroideries which are not produced in this country, to any appreciable extent, pay 40 per cent. Add the importers' and the stallholders' profits, the tax reaches the enormous amount of 50 per cent. The same figures apply to cotton velvets and many other articles of general use among the masses.

See the disadvantages of our farmers compared with those of foreign countries. Certain styles of common dress goods, which are imported largely into this country, cost in England and France 13 cents per yard. The same goods, with duty added, cost in this country 25 cents per yard. The farmer in England and France gets for his wheat \$1 a bushel. Our farmers west of the Missouri River obtain for their wheat about 50 cents a bushel. In other words, our farmers pay almost twice as much for what they buy as the foreigner, and they only receive 50 per cent. as much for what they sell. Can it be possible that our Representatives and Senators in Congress are aware of these facts? And if they are, will they dare to still further increase taxes to the extent proposed?

Previous to the meeting of the last Republican convention in June, 1888, the Chicago Tribune, in a very powerful editorial article, asked the question: "Who will speak for the farmer?" The convention met. It spoke for the politician and for the manufacturer, and for everybody but the farmer, and that great, patient, industrious, loyal, docile class of our country was left unrepresented. In the November following, with pathetic docility the farmer voted according to his

old beliefs for a "protective" policy which is little short of robbery.

Not many weeks ago a Congressional committee was appointed to take testimony concerning the working of the tariff. The accounts of that investigation seem to indicate that nobody was invited to testify except the manufacturers. The merchants were not represented. The farmers were not represented. The great unprotected class who pay nearly all the taxes were unrepresented, and the beneficiaries of this enormous system of taxation represented themselves. The result is seen in the present bill which is before Congress. And what a sight it is. Self-interest in the halls of the Capitol testifying in its own behalf. The collectors of the taxes clamor for more. Theayers of the taxes apparently indifferent or ignorant of what is going on.

The present tariff has been continued in operation nearly twenty-seven years, it is high time that our infant industry should have placed themselves in a position where they will require less rather than a more tariff, as they are now demanding.

Patents, which are the reward of genius and invention, usually run out in seven years. The tariff has lasted twenty-seven years.

No manufacturer is entitled to a bounty of 50, 60, 70, 80 or 100 per cent for doing business. The manifest injustice of this discrimination in favor of any class of people is only too evident.

The tariff should be reduced largely as soon as possible, and as far as possible, to a minimum protection. It should be of a modest character, and not a guarantee of enormous profits to anybody who chooses to embark in the manufacturing enterprises. Surely the mass of the people are entitled to some consideration, and equal justice in these matters should be meted out to all.

A reduction of tariff would of course create a depreciation of values in certain directions; but how much have farm lands depreciated with the last five years, owing to the depreciation of crops? The amount is equal, probably, to more than the entire value of all the manufacturing plants in this country. Yet that shrinkage has been born uncomplainingly, and without any great disaster.

Without a doubt the ordinary market of the excessive taxes collected by the Government under the tariff, has become a very serious matter.

The Treasury is full to overflowing and has a very large surplus. Meanwhile, money throughout the country is uncomfortably close, and business enterprises are retarded and jeopardized through a lack of available funds.

In order to get this Treasury surplus into circulation again in the ordinary channels of trade, unusual and unnatural methods are adopted, and in the exercise of those methods the Secretary of the Treasury is invested with a discretionary power which is without parallel in the history of finance. Some secretaries may exert that power judiciously. Some, we may have a speculating secretary, whose interests will be the direction of a very tight money market and a consequent depreciation of values. Such a possibility should not exist, and would not under a judicious tariff.

Since writing the above I have received a sketch of the proposed tariff bill now being considered by Congress, and find the increased duties so much greater than anybody anticipated that I herewith append a comparative list of some principal items, being unwilling to do any injustice to the insatiate greed of the tariff "revisers." Specific rates are computed ad valorem, for comparison:

McKinley bill	Present proposed duty	Present duty	per cent. per cent.
Cotton warp dress goods, costing less than 15c sq.yd. 60 @75 81 @98	goods costing 8d for 36-in. 60 @75 90 @105	from 15 to 2 1/2 sq. yd. 60 @75 90 @105	(goods costing 8d for 36-in.)
Farmer satins below 15c sq.yd. 61 @68 86 @90	from 20c upward..... 51 @82 61 @98	(this class includes 3 of our grades) from 15 to 2 1/2 sq.yd. 61 @68 95 @100	(this class includes 3 of our grades) from above 20c sq. yard..... 71 @75 85 @90
Ceylon suiting (fancy man- sions, val.) between 10c and sq. yard..... 75 125	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90
Woolen goods costing 6s a yard, 50 in. wide..... 57 1/2 @70 67 @84	peacock shawls..... 66 @95 72 @118	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90
Eglish spring shawls..... 51 63	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90
Cashmere gloves..... 65 85	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90	10c..... 71 @75 85 @90
French all-wool goods costing 1 franc per meter..... 70 80	French all-wool goods costing 1 franc, 36-in. wide..... 85 110	French cashmere..... 65 @87 1/2 @84 @113	French cashmere..... 65 @87 1/2 @84 @113

JAMES H. WALKER.

### The Bounty Business.

A bounty on sugar, silk or anything else is a rascally imposition on the people. All the industries in this country, of course, would like to receive bounties, and thousands of them need bounties, but that is no reason why the Government should pay them. Least of all is it a reason why Congress should vote bounties to two public industries and not vote them to 2,000 others just as feeble. If the Government is to go into the bounty business at all it should at least deal out bounties impartially to all the interests that need them.

But if the Government is bent on assisting a few industries at the expense of all the rest, it must be admitted that the method of assisting them by bounties is far preferable to assisting them by a protective tariff. When a bounty of \$5,000 a year is paid to an industry, the country is plundered of only \$5,000. But when a tariff is laid on imports in order that that same industry may raise its prices \$5,000, the prices of imports are raised also, and the people are plundered of perhaps \$5,000,000 that the protected industry may realize \$5,000. By the bounty system, therefore, the people not only lose less, but are able to tell exactly how much they lose. There is nothing so ruinous to a country as a taxation by stealth.

These bounties will also do good by educating the people. Comparisons will everywhere be instituted between bounties and the tariff, and when it is seen that the tariff is even more iniquitous than bounties, and that both confer gratuities upon favored classes, the conclusion drawn must be a salutary one. In this view, we say, let the bounties be piled on.—Chicago Herald.

### The Trusts Are Safe.

In the dispatches from Washington announcing the passage in the Senate of the anti-trust bill, it is stated that the measure stands no show of being acted on by the House at the present session. This was doubtless well understood by the Republican Senators, or else they would have found some excuse for killing it.

There is not the slightest doubt that it is a buncome measure. The Republican politicians do not intend to prevent or punish trusts. If they did they would not discard the most palpable and potent remedy—the withdrawal of the tariff protection under which five-sixths of the trusts organize and prosper.

The object of a protective duty is to enable the home producer to charge more for his product than he would be able to do without it. If the duty fails in this, protection fails to protect. The combination in protected industry to secure entire control of the home market—in other words, to stop all competition and make the monopoly complete and effective—is the logic of protection carried to its full length.

And this is why the Republican Congress will do nothing to forbid trusts.—Lansing Journal.

### Plain Facts Repeated.

Germany has shut out our pork. France has shut out our pork, and now

Canada has put a heavy protective duty on lard. These are all retaliatory measures. The people of these countries want our products and we want theirs. We close our markets against them and they retaliate. The manufacturers, in whose interests this is vicious and corrupt policy in this country is pursued, grow rich and the farmers grow poor. How many thousands and tens of thousands of times must these plain facts be repeated to our farmers before they all understand them?—Grand Rapids Democrat.

### A NATIONAL SCANDAL.

#### SCATHING ARRAIGNMENT OF QUAY AND QUAYISM.

Serious Charges Against the Chairman of the National Republican Committee—An Open Letter from Henry C. Lea to Ben Harrison.

Henry C. Lea, the book publisher, respected as one of the most upright, intelligent and earnest citizens of Philadelphia, has written the following open letter to President Harrison:

To the President:

"Sir—No grave scandal has darkened our political history than the charges brought against Senator Quay by the New York *World* in its issues of Feb. 10 and March 3. It would be useless here to recapitulate them further than to say that, with full details of names and places where the political *World* asserts him to be a man who has been most disloyal and brought the same power into play, it is a scandalous and disgraceful disloyalty, and including the temporary abstraction from the State's Treasury of \$260,000 in one instance and of \$400,000 in another.

"No such accusations, involving injury so varied and so continuous, and supported by such an array of minute detail, have ever been, I believe, brought against a politician so conspicuously. If they are true, Senator Quay ought to be in the penitentiary. If they are false, he is a cruelly libeled man; his accusers are a journal of the highest financial standing, and no jury of his countrymen would refuse him exemplary damages that would put him beyond all future reach of want. Vindication and profit bring the strongest incentive to prove his innocence, but although the evidence has been closed, neither solicitude for his character nor desire of gain has prompted him to break silence. It is his own fault if the public should regard him as acquiescing in the truth of the charges.

A NATIONAL SCANDAL.

"It is true that the crimes alleged against Senator Quay are connected only with his career as a Pennsylvania boy, but your close connection with him has rendered the scandal national. You were duly warned in advance from a friendly source of the dangers of such an alliance, yet by accepting his man, Mr. Wanamaker, as a member of your Cabinet you assumed responsibility for both of them. In your name and in your alliance you have enlarged Mr. Quay's important and vicious giving him control of the Federal post office in Pennsylvania, thus rendering him the dictator of the Republican party in the State. He boasted of your sub-servi-*cy* to him when, in explaining his triumph over Representative Daizell in the struggle for the Pittsburgh postoffice, he publicly said that 'the President, though very anxious to gratify Mr. Daizell, for whom he has a high esteem, could not, under all the circumstances, well afford complying with my wishes.' Even Mr. Quay's remarkable silence under the accusations of the *World* does not seem to have lessened his influence over you. He signalized his return from Philadelphia a week or two since by capturing the Pittsburgh Surveyorship of Customs, and the leading commercial urged respectively by Secretary Blaine and Representative Daizell. Indeed, his power would seem to be as great in Washington as in this State, for the party organization is now so well that he has been endeavoring to buy off a superfluous candidate for the Governorship with an Assistant Secretaryship of War. In thus entering into a political partnership with Mr. Quay you must share the losses as well as the gains of the venture. It is not Pennsylvania alone, nor even the Republican party only, that has a right to protest; every citizen of the land must feel humiliation at the snitch thus inflicted on the Chief Magistracy of the nation.

AN ACCOUNTING DEMANDED.

"As a Republican I am ardently desiring the success of your party, so long as it deserves success, let me request you, as President, to take a calm survey of the situation and render to yourself an account of your stewardship. Thirteen months ago you entered upon the duties of the highest office which the world has to bestow; your party was supreme in the control of both houses of Congress and of the executive; everything promised a prosperous and useful administration, in which you, by simply adhering to the pledges under which you were elected, might earn another term from the confidence and gratitude of the people. The only cloud upon the political horizon was your acceptance of a Postmaster General at Mr. Quay's dictation, ostensibly as a reward for certain services performed during the campaign. That cloud is no longer than a man's hand has spread till it covers the firmament. Look back now and reflect on your work. You have sedulously devoted yourself to the distribution of 'patronage'; you have turned out nearly 40,000 Democratic office-holders, and in this ignoble business you have filled vacancies thus made by giving 'recognition' to the worst elements in the party. You have thus degraded it to the lowest level, till it no longer deserves or enjoys the public confidence and its interest, as well as that of the nation, demands its purification by defeat. You have earned for it the denunciation of the Hebrew prophet:

"The hand thereof judges for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money, yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, is not the Lord among us? Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field and Jerusalem shall become heaps."

A WARNING FROM THE PEOPLE.

"But it needs no prophet to foretell the result. The elections of last November were a warning that the people would not tolerate your methods. You have refused to heed the lesson, and the elections of next November will emphasize it. The narrow Republican majority in the lower house will be swept away, and your party for the latter half of your administration will be in a position of thorough defeat. You have rewarded the most infamous party in 80,000 given to you by Pennsylvania by giving them the chains of Quayism. You need not wonder that the disaffection is spreading rapidly throughout her borders in a manner that may render even her allegiance doubtful. The outlook for 1892 is darker. Were the Presidential election to take place to-morrow there could scarce be doubt of Democratic success. Let me counsel you, Mr. President, as a friend, to reflect that this has been your work in one short year of misused power.

TIME FOR REPENTANCE.