

Gaul, and others, each with a sort of tariff of its own, and some with special immunities. Goods imported by sea into Italy, for example, not for the personal use of the importer, were subject to a tax, which seems to have been mainly a tax on luxuries, since pepper, cinnamon, myrrh, ginger, perfumes, ivory and diamonds, are among the dutiable goods mentioned in one of these tariffs. Sicily had a tariff-tax quite distinct from this, since one-twentieth of the value of the goods (5%) was levied on the frontier on all imports and exports; and a similar tax of one-fortieth was laid by the Sempronian law on the province of Asia. These imposts, too, were leased to contractors, which gave, of course, some chance of fraud and wrong. There were other temporary taxes, like those, for instance, which Augustus laid of 5% on legacies and inheritances, and of 1% on articles publicly exposed for sale.

Green's History of England (I., 322 *et seq.*) gives an outline of the taxes there from the beginning of the monarchy. As land was almost the only source of salable things in the early time, so it was almost the only thing on which taxes were levied. Danegeld and scutage and feudal aids fastened only on the land. "But a new principle of taxation was disclosed in the tithe levied for a Crusade at the close of Henry Second's reign. Land was no longer the only source of wealth. The growth of national prosperity, of trade and commerce, was creating a mass of personal property which offered irresistible temptations to the Angevin financiers. No usage fettered the Crown in dealing with personal property, and its growth in value promised a growing revenue. Grants of from a seventh to a thirtieth of movables, household property, and stock were demanded. The right of the king to grant licenses to bring goods into or to trade within the realm, a right springing from the need of his protection, felt by the

strangers who came there for purposes of traffic, laid the foundation for our taxes on imports. Those on exports were only a part of the general system of taxing personal property. How tempting this source of revenue was proving, we see from a provision of the Great Charter, which forbids the levy of more than the ancient customs on merchants entering or leaving the realm. Commerce was in fact growing with the growing wealth of the people." This passage shows, that, as a matter of fact, *taxes* have always hinged, and must hinge, on *trade*.

A few facts in the most recent movements of national Taxation in the United States may fitly conclude this Chapter and this Volume. Since 1867, Wool and Woollens have been the ass, upon whose breaking back the most conspicuous burdens have been piled; and the "McKinley Bill" so-called, still pending at the present writing in the Senate, heaps up still higher the groaning loads. The following table shows how futile is the attempt to keep out wools and woollens from such a country as ours, even by the most exaggerated barriers:—

IMPORTS OF WOOLS AND WOOLENS.
(Calendar Years.)

Years.	Wools.	Woollens.
1886.....	\$17,403,099	\$43,995,641
1887.....	15,645,020	45,065,986
1888.....	14,542,244	49,984,298
1889.....	18,696,277	54,080,159
1890.....	(fiscal year)	56,582,000

Roger Q. Mills of Texas stated from his place in the House of Representatives in 1888, that the United States grows but about 265,000,000 lbs. of wool yearly, while it

takes about 600,000,000 lbs. to clothe our own people. Why should more than half the wool needed to clothe the people be taxed in such a way as to double (in general) the cost of the people's clothing? And why should Benjamin Harrison, now President of the United States, have said in that same year, in view of these elsewhere unheard-of taxes, and in view of the average climate of his country, that somehow it seemed to him *that cheap clothing implied a cheap man*? In view of the enormous natural demand for woollens, in order to keep comfortable day and night 64,000,000 of inhabitants, is it not strange, and must there not be artificial causes for it in the kind and mode of national Taxation, that the United States has but 16 sheep to the square mile, while Germany has 92, France 111, and Great Britain 339?

Senator John Sherman stated in his place in August, 1888, and again in substance Sept. 2, 1890, that a line of custom-houses on our joint-frontier with Canada was "*the height of nonsense, and almost a crime against civilization.*" Well might he say this in view of what his colleague, Allison of Iowa, has recently said, namely, that the Dominion bought in 1880 of the United States 8% of its brass goods, 86% of its copper manufactures, 94% of its cordage, 88% of its gingham, 65% of its glasswares, 99% of its rubber goods, 94% of its printing ink, 92% of wooden wares, 91% of tin-ware, 90% of wall-paper, 72% of paper wares, 98% of ploughs, 97% of engines, 99% of sewing-machines, and 90% of miscellaneous machinery.

The imports and exports of the United States for the last two fiscal years are as follows:—

	1889.	1890.
Imports, free.....	\$256,487,078	\$265,588,499
Imports, dutiable.....	488,644,574	523,633,729
Total.....	745,131,652	789,222,228
Exports.....	742,401,375	857,824,834
Gold and Silver { Imports.....	28,963,073	33,976,326
Exports.....	96,641,533	52,148,420
Total Imports.....	774,094,725	823,198,554
Total Exports.....	839,042,908	909,973,254

There are two or three noticeable points from this table. First, the large relative increase of free imports over those of former years. Free articles in 1867 were less than 5% of the whole; in 1882, 30%; and in 1890, 33.9%. The Free List, so-called, has indeed been enlarged in the interval, but free goods tend naturally to swell over the taxed goods, so that in 1890 the free were almost exactly one-half of the taxed. Second, of the large total of merchandise exports, it is to be sorrowfully noted, that more than 82% of the whole is made up of the products of agriculture and forests and mines (not gold and silver); while manufactures compose only 17.8%. What ails our manufactures, that we cannot sell them abroad? We have been for 30 years under a vaunted scheme warranted to develop manufactures,— expressly designed and recommended to make them cheap and good,— under an elaborate and artificial scheme that makes everything bend, even the backs of the toiling millions, to foster and propel manufactures! But we do not succeed in selling much of them abroad, except some fractions of them to Canada. The ratio of them to the total of exports of merchandise seems to be growing less: in 1889, 18.9%; in 1890, 17.8%.

The simple truth is, that we are able to sell abroad even this beggarly proportion of manufactures to the total exports of merchandise, only in consequence of a shrewd device working within the Grand Device, namely, the so-

called "Free List." Some of the little wheels within the big wheel revolve rapidly. Manufacturers do not like to pay protectionist tariff-taxes *themselves* any better than other people like to pay them. They have by their own open confession in overt act precisely the same opinion of their deadening influence, that other people have. If, however, they can escape such taxes on the things they have to buy, especially their raw material, and *keep* them on their own finished goods offered for sale in a monopoly market, they would be happy. Hence, the Free List. Hear Senator Dawes before the Paper-makers' Convention at Saratoga in 1887: "*There is one other feature of tariff revision much discussed at the present time which must not escape our attention, and that is free raw material. No industrial policy will promote the highest prosperity of both labor and capital in this country, which fails to lay down the raw material at the door of the manufactory at the lowest possible cost. In any new revision of the tariff this rule of preference for our own raw material must be adhered to by those who do not propose to give up the American for the indifferent policy in legislating between ourselves and foreigners.* IT WILL BE FOUND, HOWEVER, TO ADD VERY FEW RAW MATERIALS TO THE FREE LIST, FOR THE REVISIONS OF 1874 AND 1883 HAVE ALREADY MADE FREE ALL SUCH NON-COMPETING RAW MATERIALS AS AT THE TIME OF THE PASSAGE OF THOSE ACTS WERE ENTERING TO ANY CONSIDERABLE EXTENT INTO THE CONSUMPTION OR PRODUCTION OF THE COUNTRY."

Till now, we have been dealing in facts, and figures, and in careful generalizations after the inductive manner: let us, at the very last, indulge in a freak of fancy. Suppose for a moment, that all taxes of every name could be abolished instantaneously, and the Governments, like the Israelites, live on manna for forty years. What harm

would ensue? What industry would decline? Who would be impoverished? What stimulus to work and save and grow rich would be weakened thereby? Would not wages, and profits, and rents, all be lifted thereby, with no damage to anybody? A child can see that Taxes from their very nature are a burden, are a subtraction from income, are a *minus* and not a *plus*. Who, then, except from sinister motives, can imagine and represent, that Taxes are a good in themselves, a positive blessing, a spur to the progress of Society?

Taxes of some sort there must be for the maintenance of Governments, which are established for the good of all. Why, then, should not the Taxes be just as few, just as simple, just as comprehensible, just as universal and equitable, as is consonant with the single end of their existence at all?