

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1888.

The Week.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S admirable letter to the Fourth of July meeting in Tammany Hall will satisfy everybody that he is going to force the fighting on the tariff-reform issue. He shows no more disposition to fear the consequences now than he did when he sent his message to Congress last December. He sounds the keynote of the campaign in a few sentences, which sum up the whole question with the terseness and force of aphorisms:

"Our Government belongs to the people. They have decreed its purposes; and it is their clear right to demand that its cost shall be limited by frugality, and that its burden of expense shall be carefully limited by its actual needs. In the midst of our impetuous enterprise and blind confidence in our destiny, it is time to pause and study our condition. It is no sooner appreciated than the conviction must follow, that the tribute exacted from the people should be diminished. Those who oppose reform attempt to disturb our workmen by the cry that their wages and their employment are threatened. They advocate a system which benefits certain classes of our citizens at the expense of every householder in the land—a system which breeds discontent, because it permits the duplication of wealth without corresponding additional recompense to labor, which prevents the opportunity to work by stifling production and limiting the area of our markets, and which enhances the cost of living beyond the laborer's hard-earned wages."

Rarely has the President's gift for expressing, in the homely language of common sense, the fundamental truths of large public questions stood him in better stead. The educating influence which his leadership has already exerted was forcibly shown by the enthusiastic reception which the Tammany audience gave not only to his letter, but to the strong speech which Mr. Mills made upon the real objects and effects of his Tariff Bill. A year ago a mere mention of a speech on the tariff would have emptied Tammany Hall.

Mr. Mills's speech was a model of its kind, and we fully agree with an estimate which a Tammany leader made of its influence, that it was worth at least 10,000 votes for the Democratic ticket. It will be worth more than that if it is circulated as freely as it ought to be. Mr. Mills confined himself to a frank and simple explanation of what his bill really proposes to do. There is no point upon which light is more valuable at this time, for not one man in a hundred has the remotest idea of what the bill actually is. The Republicans all shout that it is a free-trade measure, but scarcely one of them has ever read it or an accurate outline of it. Mr. Mills showed first that it would cut down the surplus \$1,000,000 by taking the duty off lumber, for this reason: "The duty of \$2 a thousand feet has been worth \$35,000,000 to some of the 'lumber kings' of Michigan and other States, but we believed it was better that they should not make so

much money, and that the struggling farmers on the prairies, who now live in sod houses, should be enabled to get lumber so cheap that they could build nice, comfortable farmhouses." Then the bill would take the duty off salt, because nature supplies it, men and beasts are in constant need of it, and the tax is merely kept on to "foster a monopoly as selfish and grasping as exists in the world." Next, it would take the duty off tin plates, which now amounts to \$5,700,000 annually, though there is not a tin-plate manufactory in America. The abolition of this duty would not throw a single laborer out of employment.

In regard to the free-wool proposal of his bill, Mr. Mills spoke with especial force, and his words are a striking contrast to the "baa-aa" argument which Congressman Horr put forth at the recent Republican ratification meeting. There is not, he said, nearly enough wool grown in this country to clothe our people. We grow 265,000,000 pounds a year, and it requires 600,000,000 pounds to make clothing for our people. High duties keep out nearly all wools except the coarse carpet wools, and the result is the use of shoddy in the manufacture of the woollen clothing which workmen wear. Over \$44,000,000 worth of woollen goods are imported annually, at an average duty of 58 per cent. If wool were admitted free of duty, these woollen goods could be manufactured so cheaply in this country that the imports would stop, and we should soon be supplying foreign markets as well as our own, while the increase in our manufacturing product would increase enormously the demand for labor, and consequently enhance the rate of wages. Subsequently Mr. Mills showed, what has been shown over and over again, that the average duty on imports is now 47.10 per cent., and his bill proposes to reduce it to 40 per cent., a reduction of only 7.10 per cent. This is what the Republicans call free trade, and rather than submit to an average duty of 40 per cent., they declare that they will give the country free whiskey.

The President has given Congress some rudimentary but necessary instruction upon the question of pension legislation. Both houses of Congress have made repeated efforts to induce him to treat the subject, as they persist in doing, from the demagogic point of view, but he persistently refuses to do so, preferring to treat the American soldier as a man of character and self-respect rather than as a beggar. In a message sent to the Senate on Thursday he answers the recent "arraignment" made by that body upon his pension policy, by saying:

"None of us should be in the least wanting in regard for the veteran soldier, and I will yield to no man in a desire to see those who defended the Government when it needed defenders, liberally treated. Unfriendliness to our veterans

is a charge easily and sometimes dishonestly made. I insist that the true soldier is a good citizen, and that he will be satisfied with generous, fair, and equal consideration for those who are worthy entitled to help. I have considered the pension list of the Republic a roll of honor, bearing names inscribed by national gratitude and not by provident and indiscriminate alms-giving. I have conceived the prevention of the complete discredit which must ensue from the unreasonable, unfair, and reckless granting of pensions by special acts, to be the best service I can render our veterans."

He says that there are before him now more than 100 special pension bills which can hardly be examined within the time allowed for that purpose, and suggests that "It would be well if our general pensions laws should be revised with a view of meeting every meritorious case that can arise. Our experience and knowledge of any existing deficiencies ought to make the enactment of a complete pension code possible." This is a rational and statesmanlike solution of the difficulty, but there is little likelihood of Congress adopting it so long as there remains a "soldier vote" to be angled for.

Secretary Fairchild has been having, with a correspondent of the Springfield *Republican*, another of those talks on the "sugar fraud" affair which fill his friends—among whom we count ourselves—with sincere regret. This time he is replying to Mr. George William Curtis in *Harper's Weekly*, and asserts that he knows more about the matter than Mr. Curtis, because Mr. Curtis has not seen "the evidence collected by the agents of the Department." Now the agents of the Department who have got up this sugar-fraud story are simply one Byrne, a newspaper reporter at one time connected with the Boston *Herald*, and offering not a single guarantee, that we have been able to hear of, as to trustworthiness or knowledge either of frauds, sugar, custom-houses, valuations, or polariscopes. It is on the report of this man, whose selection for such a work by the government of a great commercial State may safely be called grotesque, that all this fraud story rests in the last resort. This was bad enough, but was aggravated when Assistant-Secretary Maynard undertook to make "politics" out of the report, and it is still further aggravated by Mr. Fairchild's passionate determination to stand by Mr. Maynard and see him through his troubles. Of course, if frauds at the Custom-house in the semi-scientific valuation of an article yielding such large revenues as sugar, were suspected, a civilized Government ought to have had them at once investigated; but the investigation ought to have been conducted by a commission, containing a scientific man of repute, a business man of repute, and perhaps a lawyer or politician of repute, and the evidence ought to have been taken publicly. If Secretary Fairchild really wishes to explain, he must begin by saying why he selected poor Byrne to overhaul the great

custom-houses of the country, and what Byrne was supposed to know either about sugar or evidence, and what his experience of life has been in any field. These are on their face somewhat ridiculous questions to ask, but they have to be asked and ought to be answered.

What is the matter with all the Republican leaders, orators, and editors? Not one of them seems able to speak of Harrison without in some way throwing cold water on his candidacy. "Steve" Elkins speaks of him as being a candidate of whom Warner Miller was able to say "almost with enthusiasm" that he "would come nearer to carrying New York" than any other candidate. The *Tribune* has made no concealment of its belief that Blaine would have been a stronger candidate. The *Philadelphia Press* has declared that the course pursued at Chicago, ending in Harrison's nomination, "is not the way to get a united party with trusted leadership." And now Mr. Estee, the Chairman of the Convention, in formally announcing to Gen. Harrison the fact of his nomination, says: "It is true, distinguished gentlemen, well known to the people, who were experienced in public affairs, illustrious in character, and worthy of the people's confidence and support, were before the Convention as candidates, and yet you were chosen." That is not even "almost enthusiastic."

The first really enthusiastic support of Harrison that we have seen, outside of Indiana journalism, comes to hand in Mr. Wharton Barker's *American* of Philadelphia. Mr. Barker declares that Gen. Harrison has been his favorite candidate for five years, and implies more or less directly that for that reason he feels sure of his election next November. He pronounces the platform "straightforward, sound, and strong," and remarks: "Let us by all means have an open and direct contest on the question whether the duties on foreign goods shall be high enough to protect American industry." That statement of the issue gives rise to a suspicion that Mr. Barker has not read carefully the platform which he commends, for in that the question of the campaign is stated in a very different way, and to this effect: "Rather than reduce, revise, or alter in any way, save to make higher, the present high-tariff duties, we are in favor of giving the country free whiskey." The campaign is scarcely a fortnight old yet, but the issue is already squarely drawn as to whether cheaper food, clothing, and other necessities of life, or free whiskey will be more beneficial to the American people. Mr. Barker will have to walk faster if he is going to keep up with the procession.

After a week of that prayerful consideration which he always gives to every question that has what Mr. Blaine calls "a moral side," Mr. Henry C. Bowen, the editor of our esteemed religious contemporary the

Independent, announces his cordial approval and hearty support of the free-whiskey policy to which the Chicago Convention committed the Republican party. Mr. Bowen sets an excellent example to more squeamish secular editors by disregarding the absurd pretence that it makes any difference whether or not it is "a remote contingency" in which the party would resort to this policy, rightly holding that it is a question of principle. Nor does he sympathize with those secular editors who seek a salve for their less robust consciences by advancing the theory that the removal of the tax on whiskey would not increase intemperance. He entirely agrees with Mr. Blaine that it would of necessity foster drunkenness; his exact words are: "We believe the tax to be a check on the traffic." But so much more disastrous than any increase of drunkenness, however great, does he consider any reduction in the taxes upon the necessities of life, however small, that he would remove the tax upon whiskey entirely rather than touch the tax upon wool, for instance, or upon lumber, or upon tin plates. "Rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system," the *Independent* would flood the country with cheap whiskey; and upon this platform Mr. Henry C. Bowen confidently appeals to the religious convictions of the American people.

The signs of severe mental, and even physical, suffering among the Blaineites over the charge that their candidate intrigued for the nomination at Chicago, continue to be numerous and grave. They are apparently ready to produce affidavits from various innocent men that during the whole period of the Convention's sittings he and his host, Mr. Carnegie, were absorbed in their coaching trip and in the beauties of English and Scotch scenery, and, if they had a telegraphic cipher, only used it to warn "the Boys" that Mr. Blaine positively must not be nominated. We now advise them to let the matter drop. They cannot convince a single human being who knows them or their ways of the truth of anything they say, particularly when what they say runs counter to notorious facts. Moreover, Mr. Blaine was not nominated. He is now simply a private citizen coaching with Mr. Carnegie. As such he interests very few people. Why not let him be? Why weep and curse and call names over him? Why cannot the disciples pull themselves together and be men? Life doubtless will now be hard for them, but not harder than for tens of thousands of uncomplaining widows.

Mr. Hamilton Fish, jr., is a very singular person. He told the Fassett Committee in his testimony on Monday what all his brother members of the Aqueduct Commission must have known to be incorrect, that the bad quality of the inspectors on the aqueduct was due "in great part to the character and unfitness of the inspectors sent us by the Civil-Service Commission, of which the editor of the

Evening Post is Chairman." The editor of the *Evening Post* is not Chairman of the Civil-Service Commission. The examinations for inspectors are conducted by examiners selected by the Aqueduct Commission, under rules framed by the Aqueduct Commission, which the Civil-Service Commission adopted *pro forma*. The Chief Engineer rates the papers. If Mr. Fish did not know this fact, what a man he is to be drawing \$5,000 salary from the State. If he does know it, what a man he is to go on the witness stand and swear to a misrepresentation.

Mr. Fish's testimony left no doubt whatever as to who the originators were of the scheme to turn over the building of the new aqueduct to a gang of plunderers headed by Squire and Flynn. Mr. Fish swore that the Republican Speaker of the Assembly first revealed the plot to him, and said in so many words that its success was desirable in order to strengthen the Republican party in Westchester County and keep up the Republican wing of the Legislature in the fall elections. Mr. Fish went ahead with that end in view. He laughs at the idea of taking into account the interests of this city. He drew a bill reorganizing the Aqueduct Commission by adding three new members. He had a Republican Senator introduce it. He had personal interviews with John O'Brien, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, and the principal aqueduct contractor, and with Judge Muller, the Governor's confidential friend in all the aqueduct "deal" business, and obtained from them pledges of Democratic support for the bill. As they had large Republican majorities in both branches of the Legislature, all the "Democratic support" they needed was the Governor's. Mr. Fish lobbied for the bill for several weeks, with the understanding that when it should be passed he should be one of the new Commissioners at a salary of \$5,000 a year.

The bill passed the Senate as it had been drawn, adding three new Commissioners, at a salary of \$5,000 a year each, but leaving in the Mayor and Comptroller as *ex-officio* members to look after the interests of New York city taxpayers. When it reached the Assembly, a Republican member moved an amendment striking the Mayor and Comptroller from the Commission. This left the city without a single official representative upon the Commission, and put Squire, the characterless Commissioner of Public Works, in control of the work of building the aqueduct by securing four of the seven members of the Commission who could be depended upon to follow his lead in all questions. The bill, thus amended, although denounced on the floor of the Assembly as an infamous piece of legislation, was passed by the unanimous Republican vote of that body. It was taken on the same day to the Senate, and although roundly denounced there by a Democratic Senator, was passed there by the unanimous vote of the Republican majority. The Gov-

error, in the face of all appeals and protests, appointed the men agreed upon.

We recall nothing in the curious political history of this city which is quite equal to this. We have had plenty of revelations of dishonest methods by men who, like Tweed and Sharp and our 'Boodle Aldermen, appeared to have no moral-perceptive faculties. They made money out of politics as a trade, and they could see no reason why there should be such a fuss about their doings when they were exposed; but this is the first instance in which a gentleman, brought up under the most favorable conditions for giving him high moral and public-spirited ideas of official duty, has come before the public, and avowed, without a trace of shame, that he engaged deliberately in a plot with a lot of unscrupulous politicians of the opposite party to plunder the city of New York in the interest of "politics," and to secure for himself a salary of \$5,000 a year. He refuses to say that he sees even any impropriety in entering into a "combine" with a contractor to pass a bill which that contractor favored. After this it will not do to charge that the frauds and corruption in our city politics are due to the influence of the "ignorant foreign vote." Here is a native American gentleman entering into a plot with other Americans, including a Republican Speaker of the Assembly and a Democratic Governor of the State, to cheat and rob the taxpayers of New York, and they are able to bring to the support of that plot the entire Republican majority of both branches of the Legislature and win the approval of the leading Republican organ of the city when their work was crowned with success. This whole disgraceful job was of American origin, and the men who conceived it and carried it forward to success pride themselves upon their "Americanism" as being the only genuine brand. The tremendously American *Tribune* was their sole ally and defender in the respectable press of this city, and the sole newspaper here which covered with personal abuse and vilification the gentleman who exposed the character of the head of the plunder conspiracy, and thus defeated it when its success seemed certain.

Mr. John Jarrett, whilom President of the Amalgamated Association of Iron-Workers, at present attorney for protection, gave some testimony before the Senate Committee on the relations of labor and capital, which it is worth while recalling. Said he: "The wages paid the iron and steel-workers (I refer to those who are connected with our organization) are on the whole tolerably fair. I claim that this condition is simply the result of organization among the workmen. . . . As a rule, in such mills as are not controlled by our organization, lower wages are paid. Of course, there are all sorts of arguments used by the owners of these mills. . . . They claim that the controlling influence whereby wages are governed in this country is the tariff, and they say they pay all the tariff guarantees them." He went on to say that

this claim was all humbug, and that it was the Association alone that forced employers to pay good wages. At the same time he put in a valiant plea for protection, though he was considerably distressed by the close questions of Senator Call, who finally brought him up squarely as follows: "I understand you that, but for the trades-unions, the benefit of the tariff would be absorbed wholly by the manufacturers?" The President of the Amalgamated got the better of the advocate of protection in Mr. Jarrett, and he replied, "It would be largely so." We commend these statements to those iron-workers in the West who are now trying to find out what is the true market price of their labor unaffected by the tariff, and whom the manufacturers, or a few of them, are trying to fool with the old "claim" that wages must go down on account of tariff agitation.

An interesting outcome of the tariff war between Italy and France is the appeal for Governmental assistance now made by the wine-producers of southern Italy, who find themselves with over two hundred million litres of last year's wine on hand, its market having been cut off by the "war." They now contemplate the utilization of this stock by distilling it, and they petition the Government to refund excise taxes already paid on the wine, to reduce the distillation tax on their behalf to one-half its usual rate, to confer a considerable bounty on the exportation of spirits, and to give them reduced rates of transportation on the Government railways. It is not very likely that these demands will be granted, for not only would they entail a very considerable expense themselves, but the fear is entertained that the granting of them would be the signal for a flood of claims for help from other industries in distress.

The alleged Parnell letters still agitate British society and politics. The Liberals are indulging in fierce denunciation of the Attorney-General, who appeared as counsel for the *Times* in the libel suit brought by O'Donnell, for reading these letters in his opening speech, and then failing to prove their authenticity, to which he answers that the Court cut him short, and would not let him present his evidence because the plaintiff's case was so poor. Parnell, who was subpoenaed but not called, has denounced them as forgeries in his place in the House of Commons, but the *Times* says his "naked denials" do not suffice, and says this, while loudly proclaiming that under no circumstances would it tell him how the letters came into its hands, or what reason it has for believing them authentic, except that it considers Parnell capable of writing them. Michael Davitt has intervened in the discussion to make an excellent suggestion, namely, that if the Attorney-General really believes the letters to be genuine, and really believes that the letters show complicity in assassination, it is his bounden duty to prosecute Parnell criminally as an accessory before the fact. As long as this is not done, indeed, the whole

affair must wear the air of campaign thunder.

As a question of social ethics the affair is an odd one to occupy a society which plumes itself so much as English society does on its nicety in matters of honor and fair play. Until now it has been held everywhere, if A produces a letter alleged to be written by B, and damaging to him, and B denies that he wrote it, A is then bound to produce his reasons for believing that B did write it, and chief among these reasons would be an account of the manner in which it came into his (A's) possession. The curious part of the Parnell case is, that A here refuses to acknowledge that B's demand imposes on him (A) any burden of further proof whatever. If the case went to trial in a court of law, the *Times* would produce the letters, and Parnell would repudiate them. The *Times* would then produce experts to testify that they were in his handwriting. He would doubtless produce just as many to testify that they were not in his handwriting. The *Times* would then be asked for corroboration in the shape of a history of the letters. This, however, it declares it will under no circumstances give. If there were no "politics" in the matter, of course such a declaration would produce general derision.

A year ago, when some allusion was made to these charges of the *Times* in the House of Commons, the Irish party challenged a full investigation at the hands of a Parliamentary committee, which they were willing to have composed exclusively of political opponents. The Ministry rejected the proposal, and the *Times* strenuously opposed it, insisting that a court of law was the only place for such a proceeding. To this the Parnellites made answer that they were not willing to go before a jury of London tradesmen animated by the usual prejudices of their class, and that they did not wish the investigation to be hampered or restricted by the rules of "legal evidence." For the passion for "legal evidence" in all investigations of a political character, where it is desirable for any reason that the field of inquiry should be narrowed, and all the probabilities on which men form their judgments in the ordinary affairs of life be shut out from view, is just as strong in England as it is here. But the effect on the public mind of the refusal of the Parliamentary inquiry was very great, and discredited the *Times* considerably, if not fatally. It is not likely that the O'Donnell trial will help it. In fact, it is hard to resist the belief that the youth who conducts that journal and his exceedingly simple-minded proprietor have been made the victims of a monstrous imposture by a knot of Irish speculators, who have sold them for a good round sum a sackful of blood-curdling but skilfully prepared documentary revelations. If the secret history of this bargain ever comes out, it will probably be as entertaining as anything in the history of credulity and deceit.

THE PROPOSED SUGAR BOUNTY.

THE debate upon Mr. Cannon's proposition to repeal the tariff on sugar and establish a system of bounties in its stead, demonstrates the incapacity of the Republican party to deal with the surplus. The controversy was practically confined to the Republicans, and the participants were almost equally and altogether irreconcilably divided. Mr. Cannon received the applause of the one faction when he declared that if he must choose between untaxed sugar and untaxed spirits, he would vote for untaxed sugar. Mr. Kelley called forth the applause of the other when he quoted the protection plank in the Chicago platform, and eulogized its demand for the repeal of the internal-revenue system, by declaring that he was ready to say, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen the glory of the Republican party." Neither faction confined itself to the advocacy of its own line of action; each condemned that proposed by the other.

Mr. Cannon and his supporters showed that while the unprotected industries of the South had been bounding forward, the production of sugar in Louisiana had fallen from 218,000 hogsheads in 1880 to 145,000 in 1886. In other words, the policy of protection had failed. Mr. Kelley and his supporters dealt blows to the bounty proposition. Mr. Kelley declared that it was contrary to all precedent and contrary to the genius of American institutions. Mr. Holmes of Iowa denounced it as bad ethics and bad financial legislation. Mr. Anderson of Kansas declared that the proposition was one to give to the Republican party the shibboleth of bounty instead of the shibboleth of protection. Never was so much economic truth heard from the lips of protectionist Congressmen. On the one side it was admitted that the protective tariff is a bounty system, and on the other a bounty system was denounced as iniquitous and contrary to the principles of democratic government.

Many good Republicans have expressed surprise that the party leaders in the national Convention did not endorse the policy represented in this debate by Mr. Cannon, instead of that represented by Mr. Kelley. To the mass of Republicans free sugar, with or without bounties, has for a long time seemed the wisest and the most acceptable method of getting rid of the surplus. Even the *New York Tribune*, in its issue of September 22, 1886, declared itself as follows:

"The Tribune does not believe that taxes on tobacco and liquor ought to be reduced or removed while the tax on sugar and other necessities of life is retained without change."

So long as the conspiracy which seized the government of Louisiana by crime, and which defrauds a majority of the people at every election, continues to send Democratic representatives to Congress, the *Tribune* does not consider that they have any right to plead protection as a pretext for a duty which is contrary to Democratic principles, and which, from a revenue point of view, should be reduced rather than any tax on luxuries or vice."

This bloody-shirt declaration in favor of protection only to Republicans, would not, indeed, have formed a very valuable campaign document in a closely contested election. Nevertheless, the fact that no Repub-

licans are benefited by the sugar tariff certainly seemed to join with everything else in pointing towards the sugar tax as the first one to be reduced. Yet when the Chicago Convention met, free sugar was not mentioned, and free whiskey was demanded rather than reduce in any way the protective tariff which the war had established.

Such seeming perversity on the part of the Committee on Resolutions certainly calls for an explanation. It is hardly enough to say that the corporations which dictated the platform had been living in a fool's paradise, and lost all sense as to the feeling of the masses. Maj. McKinley certainly knew in some degree the sentiments of his constituents, and he would not have drafted that platform had he seen any other way in which the interests of protection might be maintained permanently. Mr. Kelley's speech on Saturday is the clearest indication yet given as to the line of argument which governed the Committee. They saw that a declaration in favor of sugar bounties would be an open confession that the protective tariff is a tax upon the consumer. They also saw that in the face of public opinion the Republican party dare not exchange the shibboleth of protection for the shibboleth of "bounty"; and, lastly and chiefly, they knew that a bounty to the sugar interest was, for good reason, contrary to all American precedent. The only bounty ever granted to any industry was that to the fisheries in the early days, and this was avowedly an administrative measure for the maintenance of a school for a volunteer navy. The giving of a bounty of \$6,000,000 a year directly to a particular interest, without any warrant either in the written Constitution or in precedent, was a measure which the Committee on Resolutions at the National Republican Convention was naturally reluctant to demand.

We are not in the habit of arguing against the constitutionality of a protective tariff. The dictum of John Marshall, that where a general power is given to the national Government the means by which it shall be exercised must be left to the discretion of Congress, has always seemed to us final upon this point. Yet the disbelief in the constitutionality of such taxes is not confined to unreconstructed Democrats. Judge Cooley, in his 'Principles of Constitutional Law,' states the matter as follows:

"Constitutionally, a tax can have no other basis than the raising of revenue for public purposes; and whatever governmental action has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise a revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the sake of some home manufacturer, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principle."

If this be the constitutional status of a protective tariff which Congress imposes in carrying into effect a power certainly granted it, what possible justification is there for granting a bounty without even the pretence that it is to regulate commerce or carry out any one of the powers delegated to the national Government? The national Government, as every one knows, is one with no powers except those expressly granted it. The State

government is one with all powers except those expressly prohibited. Yet in the year 1874 a State law authorizing bounties was decided unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, only one judge dissenting. Justice Miller gave the decision of the court as follows (Loan Association vs. Topeka, 20 Wall., 653, 664):

"If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business which employs labor and capital. The merchant, the mechanic, the innkeeper, the banker, the builder, the steambot owner, are equally the promoters of the public good, and equally deserving the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to two-thirds of the business men of the city or town."

Even a Pennsylvania court (Sharswood, J., in 62 Pa. St., 491-495) has taken the same position:

"To lay with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizens, and with the other to bestow it on favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and taxation."

To not only exempt one industry from taxation, but to make it the recipient of taxes, is to give to it the feudal privilege of legal robbery. When, through our local governments, the favored industry subjects property-owners to contribution, the courts have uniformly denounced the crime as "robbery." If our national Government should subject the laborers of the country to contribution in order to grant a bounty to the sugar-planters of Louisiana, the same crime would be involved. The Republican party is incapable of reducing the surplus. The policy advocated by one faction violates the moral instincts of the nation; the policy advocated by the other violates the principles of its constitutional law.

CHEAP CLOTHES.

A FORTNIGHT ago we quoted the following from a speech of Gen. Harrison last March:

"I am one of those uninstructed political economists that have an impression that some things may be too cheap, that I cannot find myself in full sympathy with this demand for cheaper coats, which seems to me necessarily to involve a cheaper man and woman under the coat. I believe it is true to-day that we have many things in this country that are too cheap, because whenever it is proved that the man or woman who produces any article cannot get a decent living out of it, then it is too cheap."

We said then that this was distinctly the talk, not of a hard man, but of a man who was literally, as he himself admitted, "uninstructed"—that is, had not reflected on his topic. When he touched on the moral aspect of cheap clothing, he was evidently much in the state of mind of Gen. Hancock when the latter took up the tariff in the campaign of 1880. He had doubtless heard that the tailors and seamstresses who make cheap clothing are often poorly paid, and he knew that if he were conscious of wearing a coat which had been made by poorly-paid labor, he, being a well-to-do man, who goes to an expensive tailor, would feel uncomfortable; so he wandered on over the subject in a hazy way until he reached the conclusion that all cheap clothing was a bad thing, and that a man or woman who wore a