

poor neglected little one, giving a description of the mother of the man who produced her fall, and stating the alleged fact of his departure for other parts. The writing even went so far as to delineate the social standing of the grandparents of the deserted little chap.

All of this array of falsehood was not only wicked, but absolutely ridiculous. Who is so thin brained as to take as genuine a description given under such conditions of persons whose chief object is to prevent a disclosure of their identity. This part of the note was only equalled by the following:

"The parties interested are entirely ignorant of its whereabouts, so you can rest assured that your claim will never be interfered with."

Of course there was no idea that the finding of a foundling on a doorstep in a city where such incidents rarely occur would become a subject of popular knowledge and comment, and that the Paul Prys of the press would get hold of the details; consequently how could there be any possible opportunity for the parties interested to get to know where the waif was placed?

The fact is criminals of this class are not over-burdened with brains, and in carrying out a game of deception they generally cover it with figurative mosquito muslin.

It is not improbable that incidents of the kind under consideration, so common elsewhere, will increase as the volume of population swells by reason of fresh influxes from other quarters. The poor little fellow left in the tender care of Mrs. Adkins may be looked upon as a probable product of the boom.

**CHAMPIONS OF FREE TRADE.**

Your issue of Saturday, March 29th contained, under the heading "Discussing the Tariff," some excellent general remarks about the responsibility of speakers. We concur in the views expressed in the first part of the article named; but later on there occur some remarks that cause us to think the writer either misapprehended the argument of the free-traders, or he was misinformed in regard to it. Hence, we asked that the portions of our statistics to which the writer refers be given space in your valuable columns.

The article says:

"The speakers in the affirmative laid before the audience statistics, or alleged statistics, in support of free trade, which were obviously beyond the power of any human being to check, that is to sustain or refute by sound logic based upon sure premises, and the defenders of a protective tariff did the same thing. Among these statistics, for example, were figures which purported to represent the national wealth of this country at different periods prior to 1850. The champions of free trade had a

lot of figures which went to show that the country prospered most under a low tariff, and the advocates of protection had a lot of figures covering the same periods of time, which went to show that the country prospered most under a protective tariff. Now these figures were worthless. They were mostly fictitious."

1. No statistics purporting to represent the wealth of this country prior to 1850 were presented by the champions of free trade.

2. The figures presented by us were taken from the tenth census of the United States, and are therefore neither worthless nor fictitious.

For example, Mr. Paul's figures on this point were:

"The increase in the value of our farms between 1850 and 1860, the free-trade era of low tariff, was as follows:

1850.....	\$ 3,271,000,000
1860.....	6,645,000,000

Total increase, 10 years..... \$3,374,000,000  
Yearly increase 10% per cent.

Contrast that increase with the past 20 years of high tariff:

1860.....	\$ 6,645,000,000
1880.....	10,197,000,000

Total increase, 20 years..... \$ 3,552,000,000  
Yearly increase, 2% per cent.

In ten years of low tariff our farms doubled in value; in twenty years of high tariff, they have increased only 54 per cent.

The census figures are:

Value of Farms.

1850.....	\$ 3,271,575,426
1860.....	6,645,045,007
1870.....	9,362,803,803
1880.....	10,197,967,776

(Compendium of the Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Part I, page 658.)

On manufactures Mr. Paul's figures were as follows:

The increase in the capital invested in manufactures has been:

1850.....	\$ 533,000,000
1860.....	1,009,800,000

Yearly increase, 9 per cent.

1860.....	\$1,009,800,000
1880.....	2,790,000,000

Yearly increase, 8 1/2 per cent.

That is, manufacturing capital grew faster under a low than under a high tariff.

The census figures are:

Capital invested in manufactures:

Year.....	Amount.
1850.....	\$ 533,245,351
1860.....	1,009,855,715
1870.....	1,694,567,015
1880.....	2,790,272,606

(Tenth Census of the United States, Vol. II, Statistics of manufactures, page XI of remarks.)

Mr. Elliot's statistics on the financial growth of the United States since 1850 were: 1850, \$7,000,000,000; 1860, \$16,000,000,000; 1870, \$30,000,000,000; 1880, \$43,000,000,000; showing that the national wealth more than doubled between 1850 and 1860, and increased only 42 per cent between 1870 and 1880. Mr. Elliott explained that the figures for 1850 and 1860 are for taxed property only; while those for 1870 and 1880 are for all property, taxed and untaxed (see Compendium, 9th census, page 636).

The census figures are: 1850, \$7,135,760,228; 1860, \$16,159,616,068; 1870, \$30,068,518,507; 1880, \$45,642,000,000. (Compendium 9th census, pages 638-9; and 10th census,)

As an introduction to Mr. Burrows' figures, his words should be quoted;

"Manufacturers say they cannot manufacture certain articles in this country unless a tariff keeps out the products of European pauper labor. The protective tax is levied so that the manufacturer can afford to make the same goods as are made in Europe, and yet pay his men American wages.

"The protection on pig iron is \$6.-72 a ton. Pig iron sells in this country at \$17 per ton; the price of foreign iron before the duty is paid on it, is \$10.26 per ton. That is, the tariff of \$6.72 per ton enables the home producer to charge \$6.72 more per on for his iron than iron is sold for in other countries, and he charges that much more for it. We therefore pay to the iron master \$6.-72 on each ton of iron that he makes, in order that he may be able to make iron and also pay his men fair wages. According to the returns of the last census, the total labor cost of making each ton of pig iron is \$3.35. But we pay the manufacturer \$6.72 per ton for making the iron, and he pays only \$3.35 in wages for each ton made. He therefore steals \$3.37 on each ton of iron he makes, besides getting his labor free of all cost. We pay this \$6.72 to the iron master, solely in order that he may pay good wages; no one ever heard of a protective tax levied for the purchase of lands, machinery, or materials for the manufacturer, but only for the payment of wages.

"The census of 1880 shows that for pig iron

The value of product was.....	\$29,315,569
The total wages paid was.....	12,880,703
Tons of pig iron made.....	3,781,021
That is, labor cost per ton, \$3.35.	

(Tenth census of the United States, 1880, vol. ii, pages 12 and 13 of the Report on the Manufacture of Iron and Steel.)

"The iron master pays \$3.35 on each ton in 3,781,021 tons, and steals from the money intrusted to him to pay wages \$3.37 on each ton in 3,781,021 tons. The amount thus stolen in 1880 was \$12,680,703.

The article says of the sugar figures:

Now they mean that the labor which produces \$242 worth of sugar is paid only \$4. This is preposterous; \$4 would not pay for the labor employed to haul the sugar cane from the field.

He declared the figures were taken from the United States census, and was undoubtedly honest in the enthusiasm with which he pointed out and denounced the wrongs of a protective tariff. But no such figures were ever contained in a government publication.

The compendium of the Tenth Census of the United States, part 2, pages 240-1, gives for refined sugar, and molasses:

Value of product, 1880.....	\$155,484,915
Total wages paid.....	2,875,032

That is the labor that refines (not "produces") \$242 worth of sugar is paid only \$4.

The article also says "From these figures it would appear that the manufacturers pay their employes \$4, while stealing \$42 from them." Yes, such is the case; the manufacturers withhold \$42 out of every \$46 entrusted to them to pay wages.

The number of pounds of sugar refined in 1880 was 1,987,613,758;