

the first ten months our exports increased \$3,902,193, or 54.8 per cent. The liberal participation of our farmers in the benefits of this policy is shown by the following report from our consul-general at Havana under date of July 26th last. During the first half year of 1891, Havana received 140,056 bags of flour from Spain, and other parts of the island about an equal amount, or approximately 208,112 bags. During the same period Havana received 13,976 bags of American flour, and other parts approximately an equal amount, making about 20,000 bags. But for the first half of this year Spain has sent less than 1000 bags to the whole island and the United States has sent Havana 168,780 bags and about an equal amount to other parts of the island, making approximately 337,000 for the first half of 1892. Partly by reason of the reciprocal trade, but more largely by reason of the removal of the sanitary restrictions, the American export of pork products to Guinea increased during the ten months ending June last \$202,570, or about 32 per cent.

#### THE "BRITISH TRADE JOURNAL"

of London, in a recent issue, speaking of the increase of American coal exports to Cuba, says: "It is another case of American competition. The United States now supply Cuba with about 150,000 tons of coal annually, and there is every prospect of this trade increasing as the forests of the island become exhausted and the use of steam machinery on the estates is developed. Alabama coal especially is securing a reputation in the Spanish West Indies and the manufactures and improvements of the Southern States will undoubtedly create an important gulf trade. The new reciprocity treaty by which the United States are enabled to import Cuban sugar, will of course boost the American coal exporters even more effectually than the new lines of railway.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

promises a repeal of the tariff law containing this provision, and especially denounces as a sham reciprocity that section of the law under which these trade arrangements have been made. If no other issue were involved in the campaign, this alone would give it momentous importance. Are the farmers of the great grain-growing States willing to surrender these new, large and increasing markets for their surplus? Are we to have nothing in exchange for the free importation of sugar and coffee, and at the same time to destroy the sugar planters of the South and the best sugar industry of the Northwest and of the Pacific coast, or are we to have the taxed sugar and coffee which a tariff for revenue only necessarily involves, with the added loss of the new markets which have been opened, as I have shown? Our commercial rivals in Europe do not regard this reciprocity policy as a "sham," but as a serious threat to a trade supremacy they have long enjoyed. They would rejoice, and if prudence did not restrain, would illuminate their depressed manufacturing cities over the news that the United States had abandoned its system of protection and reciprocity. They see very clearly that restriction of American products and trade and a corresponding increase of European

production and trade would follow, and I will not believe that what is so plain to them can be hidden from our own people. The declaration of the platform in favor of the American doctrine of protection meets my most hearty approval. The convention did not adopt a schedule, but one principle is to control all the tariff schedules. There may be differences of opinion among protectionists as to the rate upon particular articles necessary to effect an equalization between wages abroad and at home. In some not remote national campaigns the issue has been, or more correctly has been made to appear between a high and low productive tariff, both parties professing a solicitous regard for the wages of our working people and for the prosperity of our domestic industries. But under a more courageous leadership the Democratic party has now practically declared that if given power it will enact a tariff law without any regard to its effect on wages or upon the capital invested in our great industries. The majority report of the committee on platform to the Democratic National convention at Chicago contained this clause, that "when custom house taxation is levied upon articles of any kind produced in this country, the difference between the cost of labor here and abroad when such a difference exists, fully measures any possible benefits to labor and the enormous additional importation of the existing tariff fall with crushing force upon our farmers and workmen." Here we have a distinct admission on the Republican contention that American workmen are advantaged by a tariff equal to the difference between him and foreign wages, and a declaration only against the alleged "additional impositions of the existing tariff."

Again this majority report further declared: "But in making a reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industry, but rather to promote their healthy growth. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that every change of law must at every step be regardful of labor and capital and business interest." Here we have an admission that many of our industries depend upon protective duties for successful continuance, and the declaration that tariff changes shall be regardful of the workmen in such industries and of invested capital. Nothing is more indicative of new and more courageous leadership, to which the party now committed itself, than the substitute which was adopted. This substitute declares

#### PROTECTIVE DUTIES UNCONSTITUTIONAL

—high protection of low protection—all unconstitutional. A Democratic Congress holding this view cannot enact, nor a Democratic President approve any tariff schedule, the purpose or effect of which is to limit appropriations or give any advantage to the American workmen or producer. Bounty might, I judge, be paid to the importer under this view of the Constitution in order to increase important importations.

This destructive un-American doctrine is not held or taught by history,

by Democratic statesmen whose fame as American patriots reached this generation; certainly not by Jefferson or Jackson. This crusade against American ships, bitter epithets applied to American manufacturers, persistent disbelief of the opening of a tinplate mill or the increase of our foreign trade by reciprocity, are as surprising as they are discreditable. There is not a thoughtful statesman in the country who does not know the enactment of a law in harmony with the Chicago convention on the subject of the tariff would at once plunge the country into a business convulsion such as it never has seen, and there is not a thoughtful workingman who does not know that it would at once formally reduce the amount of work to be done in this country by the increase of importations which would be followed by an immediate reduction of wages to the European standard.

If any one suggests that the radical policy will not be executed if the Democratic party attains power, what shall be thought of the party (thus trifling with great interests, a threat of sub-legislation would be only less hurtful than the fact that a distinguished Democrat rightly escribed this movement as a challenge to protected industries to fight to extermination, and, another such rightly expressed logic of the situation when he interpreted the Chicago platform to be an invitation to all Democrats, even those holding the most moderate protection views to go into the Republican party.

And now a few words in regard to the existing tariff law.

We fortunately are about to judge of its influence upon productions and prices by market reports. The day of prophets of calamity has been succeeded by that of the trade reporter. Examination into the effect of the law upon prices of protection products and the cost of such articles as enter into the living of the people of small means has been made by the senate committee composed of leading senators of both parties, with the aid of the best statisticians, and the report signed by all the members of the committee given to the public. No such wide and careful inquiry has ever been made before. These facts appear from the report:

First—The cost of articles entering into use by those earning less than \$1,000 per annum, a decrease of  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., while in farm products there has been an increase in prices, owing, in part to an increased foreign demand and opening of new markets. In England during the same period the cost of living increased 1.9 per cent. Tested by the power of the purchase of articles of necessity, the earnings of our working people never have been as great as they are now.

Second—There has been an average advance in the rate of wages of .75 of 1 per cent.

Third—There has been an advance in the price of all farm products of 18.67 per cent. and all cereals 33.99 per cent. The ninth annual report of the chief of the bureau of labor of the State of New York, a Democratic officer, very recently issued, strongly corroborates as to that State the facts found by the Senate committee. His extended inquiry shows in the year immediately following the passage of the tariff act of 1890 the aggregate