

The Cost of the Present Tariff.

Some questions are addressed to the Evening Post by Mr. Chauncy G. Parker of New York, N. J., mainly relating to the cost of protection to the tax-payers of the United States.

The question is not an easy one to answer. The amount of revenue collected from duties on imported goods is of course easy to ascertain. For the last fiscal year it was about \$228,000,000.

As to the other sum—the amount paid to the producers of protected goods—there have been gross exaggerations on both sides, and any estimate must be largely a matter of conjecture.

Some persons have gone so far as to say that all manufacturers are protected and that the price of the protected articles are raised to the full extent of the duties. It is worth while to notice, therefore, that the two leading manufacturing industries of the country are absolutely unprotected.

The census of 1880 placed the product of the flouring and grist mills at \$505,000,000, and that of the slaughtering and meat-packing (not including retail butchering) establishments at \$303,000,000.

The iron and steel industry ranked third, with a total product of \$296,000,000. In the two former industries the protective system does cause a slight advance in prices, since it makes dearer the plant used, and often prevents small establishments from purchasing steel machinery.

Yet the advance in price thus caused is inconceivable, and in making estimates these exporting industries, whose development is hampered by protection, belong rather among the tax-payers than among the tax-gatherers.

If we descend to the minor industries and take in alphabetical order all those having over 1,000 establishments, we find the following list:

Table with 2 columns: Industry and Product. Rows include Agricultural implements, Blacksmithing, Boots and shoes, Bread and other bakery products, Brick and tile, Carpentering, Carriages and wagons, etc., Canned goods, etc., and Cotton goods, etc.

mixed with American ore. How many such industries have been broken down, and how many prevented from coming up by duties on raw materials, and on tools and machinery, can only be left to conjecture.

The tariff debates of Congress are full of illustrations of the clogging effect of the tariff, which is simply a device for robbing Peter to pay Paul.

In the case mentioned Congress confiscated the property of the Eastern copper smelters and handed it over to the Lake Superior mine-owners, and closed the process protection to American industry.

The Wool Question Again. In an address before the non-partisan tariff reform club, of New York, the other evening, Mr. Rowland Hazard, of a great woolen manufacturing company in Rhode Island, and a Republican at that, made a detailed statement of the variation in the price of wool under free entry and with a protective tariff since 1826.

He showed that under a low tariff, from 1826 to 1832, the price of wool advanced from 36 to 71 cents per pound, dropping to 56 cents in 1832, when wool was admitted free, but recovering to 63 cents the following year.

The price was well maintained under free entry until 1842, when the imposition of a small duty was followed by another decline and a subsequent recovery. When wool was made free again in 1857, the prices went higher still.

The worst break was under the heavy duty of the tariff of 1867, when prices went down so that sheep were slaughtered and wool could not be marketed at a profit. These figures sustained Mr. Hazard's statement of his own experience as a woolen manufacturer, that there is little if any connection between wool and the tariff, so far as the interests of the wool grower are concerned.

While the high tariff has failed to foster manufacturing, Mr. Hazard declared that "if the duty on foreign wools should be taken off, manufacturers could pay at least 10 cents a pound more for American wool, because it would be needed in mixing with foreign wools in the manufacture of goods that cannot be made in this country now because the foreign quality cannot be secured."

We have a strong confirmation of what Mr. Hazard says in the statements of Mr. Beach, one of the largest woolen manufacturers in Connecticut. In the industry in that State, one hundred different kinds of wool, foreign and domestic, are used.

Says Mr. Beach to the interviewer: "Just look at this line of samples, all made for the spring trade of 1889, on which the agents are now trying to obtain orders. You will see they number 665 different patterns—course low and fine wool, worsted and silk. There is twice as many as a mill of this size should be required to make. The goods of the finest grades can now be imported at a much less rate of duty than the very wool from which they are made."

Editors and proprietors of the Journal. GENTLEMEN—Your paper having on numerous occasions contained editorial notices of a reward, in which you state that you will pay to any person \$1,000 for proof that Benjamin Harrison ever said that one dollar per day was enough for a workingman; and \$1,000 for proof that Benjamin Harrison ever said that: Were I the Governor I would force these men back to work at the point of the bayonet (meaning the strikers who participated in the strike of 1877.)

The executive board of District Assembly, No. 186, K. of L., the Secretary of which is the accredited author of the above charges, has directed me to write you, claiming the \$2,000 upon the proof herewith submitted.

This board has never regarded your offer to have been made in good faith, as we have been reliably informed that you did not deposit a dollar in the bank where you claim to have deposited \$2,000 as a reward for the proof referred to.

We do not claim that the evidence required as proof should in every instance be verbatim or exactly in the same language used in your editorial notice, but we do claim to offer in every instance words to the same effect. I have in my possession, as the custodian of the Executive Board, the following statements, from which I only quote a small portion of the contents:

Isom Hughes testified that Benjamin Harrison did say that one dollar per day was enough for the workingmen participated in the strike of 1887 and that he characterized the strikers as law breakers and unworthy of the title of citizens.

Martin J. Murphy testified that Benjamin Harrison did say that the strikers had forfeited all claims to recognition by going on a strike; that Benjamin Harrison did get a militia company for the purpose of pursuing the strikers; that some of the strikers received only 90 cents a day; that Benjamin Harrison claimed that the railroads could not pay any more, and that the strikers were not justified in asking for more, and that \$1 was sufficient for a workingman and he ought to be satisfied.

Patrick H. King testified that Benjamin Harrison did say that the wages of the strikers was sufficient, that the men must return to work or the militia would force them to submit.

William Miller testified that Harrison, at the conference, said on two occasions a dollar a day is enough for a workingman and that if the strikers did not return to work they would be put down by the militia at the point of the bayonet.

William Shock testified that Mr. Harrison said the men had better work for a dollar a day than do what they were doing, and further, that a dollar a day was good pay for workingmen.

John Hackinson testified that Benjamin Harrison did say that one dollar was enough for any workingman and they should accept that and be satisfied.

amount over and above that required for the purpose specified to be paid to the K. of L. relief fund, to be used in similar contents and equally as laudable purposes; the money to be paid to the undersigned, being duly authorized to receive the same.

This Board charges Benjamin Harrison with having taken up arms against the strikers and threatening them with instant death at the point of the bayonet if they did not return to work; that he claimed \$1 to be sufficient for any workingman for a day's wage; that while employed by the railroad as their attorney, receiving a large salary to cause the strike to be broken, he posed as a friend of the strikers in the capacity of the Chairman of a Citizens' Committee for the purpose of deceiving the citizens and the strikers; that he gave a receipt for \$20 for four days' wages which is now on file in the Adjutant General's office; that he received for five days' service as attorney for one of the railroads \$1,000, and his sworn affidavit appears in the Federal Court room to the effect that his services for that period are worth \$1,000, while he claims that \$1 per day or \$5 for five days is enough for a workingman; that he acted in the capacity of prosecutor of the strikers, for which he received an additional fee; that he prosecuted one man who was not in the city and knew nothing of the strike, and Mr. Harrison was obliged to manufacture evidence upon which to criminate him.

The above letter has been ready by the Executive Board of District Assembly 186, K. of L., who have directed it to be forwarded to you, with a request that you reply, saying by what method you will agree to select a committee to examine the original testimony now in possession of this Board. For the Executive Board, [Signed] EDWIN F. GOULD, District Recording Secretary District Assembly 186, K. of L.

Juggling with Taxation. The one great demand of the people of the whole country is for relief from needless and oppressive taxes on the necessities of business and of life. All parties have solemnly promised it from year to year, but high war taxes have continued long after the necessity for war revenues has ceased, and to-day we present the singular spectacle of \$130,000,000 of surplus money in the treasury, exacted from the industries of the nation, withdrawn from legitimate channels of business and trade, and serving no purpose beyond oppression to tax-payers and whetting the appetite of the jobber and profligate.

Since the war we have reduced the taxes of the opulent and allowed war taxes to remain upon the common necessities of life. We have relieved corporations of millions of taxes on gross receipts; we have remitted the taxes of employers in manufacturing pursuits; we have repealed the taxes on sales; we have effaced the taxes on incomes paid only by the rich; we have made legacies and successions free; we have abolished stamp taxes, we have thus repealed some \$250,000,000 of annual war taxes paid by the rich, but the high war taxes remain on the blankets, the clothing, the tinware, the salt, the lumber and other common necessities in daily use by the workingmen of the land.

And these oppressive taxes have logically bred combines and trusts whose greed multiplies taxes upon the common needs of life and of business, until our taxes have become so extortionate that the wage-earner pays 47 cents out of his \$1 earned for taxes on very many of the articles most needed for himself and his family.

The Democrats, with two Republicans supporting them, passed a relief bill in the House. It enlarged the free list in common necessities; reduced taxes which specially oppress labor and maintained a higher standard of protection to our manufacturing industries than was ever given in any tariff when the country was free from the exactions of war. The Republicans first denounced the effort to revise our taxes and reduce our surplus revenues as needless agitation of the tariff and as unsettling the business of the country; but before the contest closed in the House, the Republicans saw that their protested promises for tariff and tax revision must either be redeemed or some pretence exhibited of doing so. The complaint of tariff agitation was abandoned, as the Republicans accepted the necessity of proposing a tariff of their own, and now, after months of careful study of the political necessities of the day, we have the Republican tariff revision bill.

And what does the Senate's tariff bill propose in relief of either the pressing necessities of business or the common necessities of life? Beyond a severe reduction in sugar that would simply destroy our sugar industries without cheapening sugar to consumers, what is cheapened of importance that affects the great mass of the people? Wool is increased, instead of making it free, as it has been during half the history of our government, and, of necessity, the present tax of about 60 per cent. on wools is increased. We say of necessity, for our woolen manufactures are so crippled by war taxes on raw materials that they are languishing and their labor ill paid even with a tax of 60 per cent. on consumers. Woolens are one of the universal necessities of life

from the cradle to the grave; our consumption amounts to nearly \$600,000,000 annually, and instead of cheapening this great necessity, we go backward even beyond a dual war taxes and increase burdens upon the whole people only to protect English mills and labor.

The refusal of Senate to give our manufacturers and our labor the benefit of the free list of raw materials, is simply a monstrous upon American capital, American labor and American consumers. It is in defiance of the earnest teachings of Republican Presidents Grant, Arthur and Garfield, and is at war with every principle of justice to labor and justice to consumers. It is turning backward the hands of progress into the darkness of Chinese walled theories, and is a fearful confession that there can be no relief to either capital or labor without an impious demand from the people in the coming election. It is an appalling declaration that the highest war taxes on the necessities of business and of life shall be continued indefinitely, and that high taxes and low wages shall be the only hope of American workingmen. It is the policy of madness, the policy of oppressing the many for the benefit of the few, and it is the most flagrant assault that was ever made upon capital, labor and consumers since the formation of the Republic. It is mean partisan jugglery with taxation; nothing more; nothing less.

Blooming Mrs. Becker. In 1864 a man named Becker came drifting into Washington with his wife. Those were the days of violence. One morning Becker left his wife's side, stepped into a cigar store to get a light, and was shot down by a blundering provost guard in hot chase of a deserter as he stepped out on the sidewalk. His wife, left penniless and in debt, had everybody's sympathy. Old Treasurer Spinner whose unreadable autograph has given us all so much delight at different times was then trying the experiment of giving women employment in the Treasury Department. He was touched like the rest, and promptly appointed Mrs. Becker to a clerkship in his office. She soon fell into the hands of the cent-per-cent. men, and before long her salary was hypothecated every month. This ran on for years.

Suddenly one day everything changed with her. She paid all her debts; she bought a fine piano and handsome furniture; she moved into a pretty house; she thought its back yard too cramped and bought a house and lot running back to it from a side street—in short, she launched out from penury into something like luxury. Her former friends, most of whom she cut for the sake of mere pretentious company, could not account for the sudden and startling prosperity except as the result of a lucky lottery winning. They thought she was one of those people who draw the \$100,000 prizes and then refuse to let their names be published.

She did not offer to solve the problem for them, but proceeded to complicate it by marrying again, only, however to turn off the young man she had selected as soon as she found him unsuitable. All this time she was in the Redemption Division of the Treasurer's office, where the worn national bank notes come to be counted before being exchanged for new ones. Last week it was discovered that she was short in her account of notes handled \$944. She absented herself from the Department, and was found at home sick in bed. She paid over \$944 to the officers of the Department and meekly accepted her dismissal. Now the question that distracts the Department is how much more money did she get away with? For ought they know she has \$90,000 or \$900,000 piled up somewhere.

Her method of operations was simple but ingenious. She made ten notes out of nine by cutting a slice out of each of the nine for the tenth and then pasting the pieces of each note together. It had to be done dexterously and expeditiously for she was under the eyes of other women and had only time enough to count each bundle as it came. She probably experimented a long time before she became so expert as to perform her little feat with success and without detection. How long she has been stealing and how much she has stolen are questions easier to ask than to answer.

There is unfortunately no way of tracing the notes she has handled, since most of them have found their way to the macerating machines and have once more become pulp—perhaps paper—and no one knows except herself what everybody in her office from the Treasurer down would like to know. And she keeps her lips tightly closed. I do not see how she can be prosecuted, since she has made restitution, and if she were prosecuted she could not be made to criminate herself further. It is very puzzling.

The quarrel now being waged on President Cleveland by the protection and high tariff advocates is precisely like that made on President Jackson, in his day, by the United States advocates. That money monopoly at one time almost usurped the powers of the Government, through its sub-agency agencies which it had established over the country, and but for the attack made on it by Gen. Jackson, in removing the Government deposits therefrom, an absolute

Trust would have been formed in the first part of the Bank which had its capital in the State and Signer Trusts of the day. And the powers of the Government would have been in a very different state of a retail dealer in these common things. The list of the United States Bank advocates still overflows, in the end, the Protectionists, Jackson throtled the one and Cleveland still the other.

It is a fact thought worthy of comment by the newspapers, records the New York Observer, that a railway magnate who recently died, made provision in his will that his wife should be executrix of all his vast estate, worth many millions. In explanation of this peculiar feature of the will, it is said that the millionaire Charles Crocker, of California, was a poor man when he married, and that he himself a tributed all his subsequent success to the practical sympathy, the good sense and the wise counsel of his wife. It is pleasant to record such a conspicuous example of perfect trust and true appreciation as this case affords. Thousands of men who might attribute their success in life to the same cause never give any tangible evidence of their recognition of the fact.

New Work for Women. Women have to work hard in the old world. A London writer in the Boston Traveler says: New occupations for women are among the needs of the fair sex here, where they are already employed as hotel clerks, ticket sellers, ushers in theatres, and, sorry to relate, brewers. Nearly every bar in England is attended by young women. But the new field for the ladies is that of house painting. Not merely decorations of interior, but good every-day painting of the outside of houses and other buildings. One agency, already finds employment for more than thirty ladies in "exterior and interior house painting and decoration." Window gardening is carried to great success in England. Societies in aid of it exist everywhere. The Lambeth Flower Association, which has just held an extremely beautiful exhibition of window gardening, has for its motto: "Make your house beautiful; bring it to flowers." The Archbishop of Lambeth Palace is a great advocate of this society.

For sixteen years General Sheridan served as President of the Army of the Cumberland. His death caused a vacancy and at a meeting of the Society of Christ-ians, on the 21st, Gen. Wm. S. R. Sears, of California, was elected to the position. The General is now serving as Register of the Treasury.

The Burden of Criminal Exile. It is manifest, I think, that when a flood of 10,000 vagrants, thieves, counterfeiters, burglars, highway robbers and murderers is poured into a colony, the class most injurious to the welfare of that colony is the liberated class. If a burglar or a thief is sent to Siberia and shut up in prison, he is no more dangerous to society there than he would be if he were imprisoned in European Russia. The place of his confinement is immaterial, because he has no opportunity to do evil. If, however, he is sent to Siberia and there turned loose, he resumes his criminal activity, and becomes at once a menace to social order and security.

For more than half a century the people of Siberia have been groaning under the heavy burden of criminal exile. More than two-thirds of all the crimes committed in the colony are committed by common felons who have been transported thither and then set at liberty, and the peasants everywhere are becoming demoralized by enforced association with thieves, burglars, counterfeiters and embezzlers from the cities of European Russia. The honest and prosperous inhabitants of the country protest of course, against a system which liberates every year, at their very doors, an army of 7,000 worthless characters and felons. They do not object to the hard labor convicts, because the latter are shut up in jails. They do not object to the political and religious exiles, because such offenders frequently make the best of citizens. Their protests are aimed particularly at the compulsory colonists.—George Kennan in The Century.

Danger of Malaria in Cities. It is a common idea that greater risk is run from this cause of disease in the country than in towns and cities, but there are strong reasons for doubting that such is the case, so far as any unhealthy influence of the country itself is concerned. If a farm house be placed in a low, swampy situation and a town in a similar locality near dwellers in the one will be no more liable to malarious disease than the inhabitants of the other. In large cities, where the ground is being constantly turned up for the purpose of laying water and gas mains, constructing sewers or for any one of the hundred other purposes for which a continual upheaval of the pavements goes on, diseases of malarial origin will almost constantly abound. Some parts of New York city, or of Philadelphia, for instance, are nearly as full of malaria as are the worst parts of Florida. There is nothing, therefore, to be gained in this respect by a hasty return from the seashore or the mountains to the pestilential atmosphere of a large town in which excavations of some kind or other are at certain seasons of the year carried on with more than usual vigor.—Dr. Wm. A. Hammond in New York World.

Mental Effects of the Weather. It is curious to think how indifferent are some people to those atmospheric changes which so significantly affect the health and temper of others. You will see one man of a rainy day, or a cold day, so transformed from good nature to acidity and bitterness that his best friends would fain get out of his way—at least till the "wind changes." Those of less sensitive organization have little patience and less pity for what they cannot understand; yet this unfortunate class are not for that removed to the cold cell that they "deserve." A little sympathy—some cheerful topic of conversation—some pleasant little personal attention at the right moment—and let the mental clouds disperse, and all again is sunshine.—New York Ledger.

THE BLUFF CALLED DOWN.

Editor John C. New Knoodled Out by Knights of Labor.

The Indianapolis Journal kept a reward of \$2,000 for many weeks for proof that General Harrison ever said that \$1 per day was enough for workingmen, and were he "the Governor of Indiana he would shoot down the strikers or force them back to work." The statement has created intense excitement all through Indiana. Edwin F. Gould, a Knight of Labor of this city, having collected statements from fifteen men who say they heard General Harrison make the remark in question, demands the \$2,000 from the Journal proprietors. The demand was made in the following letter to John C. New & son,