

Free Trade Broadside

VOL. 2

APRIL, 1909

No. 5

PUBLISHED BY THE
American Free Trade League

6 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON

Object.—The Overthrow of the Protective System
Membership.—One Dollar

Entered as second-class matter June 16, 1905, at
the post office at Boston, Massachusetts, under the
Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUBSCRIPTION 25c PER YEAR. SINGLE COPY 10c.
ISSUED QUARTERLY

The right of exchange is as sacred as any other right, and exists as much between members of different nations as between members of the same nation. Morality knows nothing of geographical boundaries, or distinctions of race. You may put men on opposite sides of a river or a chain of mountains; may part them by a tract of salt water; may give them if you like, distinct languages; and may even color their skins differently; but you cannot change their fundamental relationships. Originating as they do in the facts of man's constitution, they are unabated by the accidents of external conditions. The moral law is cosmopolite — is no respecter of nationalities: and between men who are the antipodes of each other, either in locality or anything else, there must still exist the same balance of rights as though they were next door neighbors in all things.

— Herbert Spencer.

THE LEAGUE'S QUARTER CENTURY.

This month the League completes the twenty-fifth year of its existence. Organized in April, 1884, under the name of the Massachusetts Tariff Reform League, it became the New England Tariff Reform League in 1888, the New England Free Trade League in 1894, and the American Free Trade League in 1901, broadening not only its scope but its principles as well. Its motto, "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none," indicates its unflinching purpose.

Four presidents have represented the League, Charles Francis Adams retaining the office from 1884 to 1888, Henry L. Pierce from 1888 to 1895, Henry W. Lamb from 1895 to 1904,



HENRY W. LAMB
The League's Third President

John DeWitt Warner from 1904 to the present date. The portraits of Mr. Adams and Mr. Warner have been given in previous numbers of the *Broadside*; in this issue we present those of Mr. Pierce and Mr. Lamb.

The presidency of Mr. Pierce covered an era of great promise, marked

by a political enthusiasm for tariff reform. Mr. Cleveland, during his first administration, had forced the issue upon his party and raised the high hopes of reformers. Because of this courageous act he failed of re-election in 1888, but the prominence of the question made it the issue of the campaign of 1892, which eventuated in Mr. Cleveland's triumph. At this period the bow of promise for real democracy seemed to span the horizon, in spite of the threatening silver cloud which speedily proved to be leaden.

It was during this memorable season that men of unusual character and talent, animated by high aims, rallied to the Cleveland side. Not since the Civil War has such inspiration for principle been shown. This League became a centre of leading and light, furnishing eloquent and informing speakers in the campaign as well as state and national supporters of the Cleveland policy. Of our members, William E. Russell became Governor of Massachusetts. John F. Andrew, R. D. Burnett, Sherman Hoar, William Everett, John E. Russell, Moses T. Stevens, P. A. Collins and George Fred Williams were elected to Congress, Richard Olney became attorney general of the United States, J. Sterling Morton was appointed secretary of Agriculture, and Charles S. Hamlin and Josiah Quincy were selected for assistant secretaries. Winslow Warren was called to the collectorship of the port of Boston and the city itself conferred the office of mayor successively upon Nathan Matthews, Jr., Josiah Quincy and Patrick A. Collins.

But in the day of triumph a calamity impended. In consequence of the silver legislation and administrative extravagance of the republican party,

the concomitants of a panic were evident. The financial cloud broke even before the reinstatement of Cleveland and the monetary issue eclipsed that of the tariff. Nevertheless tariff revision was forced upon Congress. The act framed in good faith by the noble man whose name the Wilson bill bore was betrayed and aborted by false friends. Enacted without the executive approval it chiefly answered the purpose of furnishing a scapegoat for the republican panic which had illogically preceded its enactment. It was a sad and discouraging day for tariff reform. The reaction which elected McKinley and assured the Dingley Bill was but the prelude to the most excessive duties yet reached, the growth of trusts, needless war and foreign conquest. Constitutional government, judicial safeguards, time-honored principles and national ideals were perverted to an end yet to be revealed.

At this unfavorable juncture for the League, Mr. Lamb became its president. No longer tempting political reformers it entered again upon the old slow work of protest and education. With faith and courage Mr. Lamb accepted the situation, counselled no weakening, was instrumental in having the League's name more affirmatively blazoned for free trade, and for nine years was its most substantial and liberal supporter. With Gen. Hazard Stevens as his secretary, there was no slackening of activity in spite of the paralysis which benumbed the movement.

The concluding five years of the League's history is unexciting. Crippled in means and out of the political lime-light, it has done what it could. Its necrology has been a saddening one, so many dear and noble comrades have departed. Fewer reunions have been held but an effort has been made through the *Free Trade Broadside* to gain new members and bring the organization in closer contact with members outside of Massachusetts, a purpose measurably attained. In nearly every state of the Union, in Canada, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, we have communication with earnest and valuable friends. Again our question has swung into the forefront and never has the League had so many co-adjutors among the newspapers and magazines of the country. Utterances



HENRY L. PIERCE
The League's Second President

for which its officers were once denounced as rash and fanatical are now the commonplaces of the press. Whatever its future may be, its honorable past at least is secure. In view of the ripening harvest which whitens the near distance it were to be regretted if the survivors of the long agitation should be content to stack arms and retire before victory is gained.

"Endurance is the crowning quality,
And patience all the passion of great hearts;

* * *

One faith against a whole earth's unbelief,
One soul against the flesh of all mankind."

CALHOUN'S WARNING VOICE

Extracts from Various Writings of
John C. Calhoun

I regard it as due to the occasion, to you and myself, to declare that under no circumstances whatever shall I support any candidate who is opposed to free trade and in favor of the protective policy, or whose prominent and influential friends and supporters are. I hold the policy to be another name for a system of monopoly and plunder, and to be thoroughly anti-republican and federal in its character. I also hold that, so long as the duties are so laid as to be, in fact, bounties to one portion of the community, while they operate as oppressive taxes on the other,

there can be no hope that the Government can be reformed, or that its expenditures will be reduced to the proper standard.

Constitutional Perversion

The Constitution grants to Congress the power of imposing a duty on imports for revenue, which power is abused by being converted into an instrument of rearing up the industry of one section of the country on the ruins of another. The violation, then, consists in using a power granted for one object to advance another, and that by the sacrifice of the original object. It is, in a word, a violation by perversion,—the most dangerous of all because the most insidious and difficult to resist. Others cannot be perpetrated without the aid of the judiciary—this may be by the Executive and Legislative departments alone. The courts cannot look into the

motives of legislators. They are obliged to take acts by their titles and professed objects, and if these be constitutional, they cannot interpose their power, however grossly the acts may, in reality, violate the Constitution.

Encouraging a Few Discourages All

The assertion that the encouragement of the industry of the manufacturing states is, in fact, discouragement to ours, is not made without due deliberation. It is susceptible of the clearest proof. We cultivate certain great staples for the supply of the world. They manufacture almost exclusively for the home market. Their object in the tariff is to keep down foreign competition, in order to obtain a monopoly of the domestic market. The effect on us is to compel us to purchase at a higher price, both what we obtain from them and others, without receiving a correspondent increase in the price of what we sell.

Selling Low and Buying High

We are constrained, by the general competition of the world, to sell low, and on the other hand, by the tariff, to buy high. We cannot withstand this double action. Our ruin must follow. In fact, our only permanent and safe remedy is, not from the rise in the price of what we sell, in which we can receive but little aid from our Government, but a reduction in the price of what we buy; which is prevented by the interference of the Government.

EDITORIAL

TO OUR READERS

For personal reasons, the secretary of the League, after five years of active service, is constrained to decline a reelection. At the annual meeting soon to be held, his successor will be chosen. As the editorship of the *Free Trade Broadside* has also devolved upon him, its continuance is uncertain. Whether the future management will elect to pursue its propaganda work in this form or another, events only can decide. Whatever course is pursued, it is deemed fitting to let the first series end with this number. An index to the seventeen issues is therefore enclosed.

As originally planned, the publication was chiefly intended to collect a golden treasury of free trade literature, embracing the noblest utterances on the subject, embodied in language worthy of preservation. Until the evil of indirect taxation is overthrown such a collection cannot be staled by age and must continue fresh and timely. The editor's personal need of such material for reference or quotation was his impelling motive in the undertaking, in the belief that others would also find it of value.

When the first number of the *Broadside* was published the tariff question was overshadowed by other issues. The editor had therefore to concentrate attention upon fundamental principles of justice, which do not change with the vicissitudes of politics, but, by a law of nature, eventually mould parties and legislation. Soon, however, the trust agitation brought the tariff (the mother of trusts) into the open arena. From platform and press once more the neglected discussion revived. More encouraging still, a new movement, a revolt of dissatisfied interests, disrupted the heretofore solid ranks of protection, leading to confessions and exposures which justify the severest language ever applied to the evil system.

Consequently, the *Broadside* found itself unexpectedly engaged in active practical discussion. Material poured in upon it in far greater measure than its space could accommodate. Legislative speeches, campaign arguments, and tariff editorials yielded effective ammunition unexampled in volume for the free trade cause. This we have tried to garner and store for future use.

Believing that the tariff evil is neither a local nor a purely national

question but a universal one, the editor has refused to narrow its scope. No policy hurtful to other peoples can possibly benefit our own. The prospect of an international free trade organization, embracing affiliated societies in every land, is a subject of rejoicing.

It has been the editorial policy of the *Broadside* to make principles paramount to expediencies, even though temporary advantage be the plausible lure. Protection, like slavery, is incompatible with democracy. Under self-government the conflict must be irrepressible, and until the wrong is extinct every compromise but postpones the settlement with more exacting penalties.

It is with unfeigned regret that the editor bids farewell to the many staunch friends who have sustained the *Broadside* by material and moral aid, for which his gratitude is not lessened by his inability to express it. He bespeaks the same cordial consideration for his successor.

* * *

THE PAYNE TARIFF BILL

The Ways and Means Committee having presented their schedule, the conflict of selfish interests begins in earnest. The proposed bill is ingenious and plausible in some respects, apparently heeding the outcry against the present duties on certain articles, like hides and wood pulp; but it is useless to discuss details, as the features of the bill are certain to be changed before it emerges safely from the House, the Senate and the President's hands.

The conflict is not between parties. There is no democratic party as regards the tariff, however distinct the organization may be on the question of offices. The cohesive power of public plunder is transcendent. No consideration of the country's needs embarrasses the situation. Each representative at Washington has a single eye to the demands of his constituents. When the lumber duty is discussed, democrats from North Carolina and other southern states with forests will line up with republicans from Maine and Oregon, mindful only of the powerful interests of their section and thoughtless of the plain people who must suffer by the tax on this prime necessity of life. No real monopoly will be vitally touched and little relief will be offered consumers. Log-rolling, a felicitous political phrase, will be literally exemplified. To save the present duty, the lumber representatives will join with the beef trust to keep the duty on hides. "You help

my interest and I'll help yours," is the approved process which statesmanship uses to block reform and retain rank abuses.

Free traders are outside the breastworks and passive, though interested, spectators. Their consolation is that the people of the nation are viewing with a new intelligence the moving picture of greed and ambition projected upon the Washington screen. It is a lesson that will in time divert popular attention from rectification of schedules to the total destruction of a system which saints could not make workable, because conceived by the adversary of mankind. *Delenda est Carthago.*

* * *

In compliance with our request Mr. Byron W. Holt sends us his estimate of the proposed Payne tariff bill:—

"The proposed Payne tariff bill is a makeshift, a patchwork, a compromise, a sham, and a fraud. It is inconsistent with the Republican platform, with so-called protection principles and with itself. It levies duties greater than the total labor cost of production in any country. It will continue to tax poverty heavily and wealth lightly! Of course it ignores the interests of consumers. It is a bill of, by, and for the trusts—especially the big ones.

Some duties, like those on iron ore, hides, coal, wood pulp, lumber, barley and paper, have been abolished or reduced that certain manufacturers may have cheaper raw materials. Some duties, like those on gloves, cotton stockings, linens, pineapples, lemons, figs, soap, perfumery and cement, have been increased because certain congressmen manufacture these articles or have "pulls" at Washington or because certain interests have to be appeased. Some duties, such as those on cocoa and tea, are put on for the purpose of obtaining more revenue. The duty on steel rails is reduced 50 per cent. to keep the railroads quiet. (The railroads still have some influence at Washington).

Nearly all of the other proposed reductions, such as those on tin plates, pig iron, steel beams, nails, wire, lead, starch, shoes, meats, lard and cabbages, are nominal rather than real. That is, the proposed law will take away only a part of the superfluous duties and will leave even more tariff protection than is now needed or used.

The "maximum and minimum" proviso in the Payne bill would institute a new and un-American system of tariff legislation. It would inaugurate discriminating duties against certain countries. It would add 20 per cent. to many dutiable articles and put duties of 20 per cent. ad valorem on articles enumerated in 67 of the 241 paragraphs in the free list. It would probably result in making the "reduced"

duties of the Payne bill average higher than those of the Dingley bill and it would lead to tariff retaliation and, perhaps, to other kinds of wars with nations now friendly.

There is nothing in the proposed bill to lower appreciably the cost of living. Under it the prices of food, shelter and clothing will continue to advance about as rapidly as they have been advancing under the Dingley bill. The breakfast table will cost more than at present. Instead of opening foreign markets for the products of farms and factories, the Payne bill will close them. It seeks to open foreign markets with a club. It will increase the demand for battleships. It is contrary to public policy and, like the present bill, is a disgrace to any civilized nation.

* * *

SOUTHERN TRADITIONS REVERSED

The manifest growth of protection sentiment in the South since its manufacturing development, indicates a reversal of tradition. While slavery existed agriculture was of necessity the chief southern interest. With slave-labor manufacturing competition with the North was out of the question. In consequence the South was solidly for free trade.

Unable to buy its necessities in the world's markets because of the tariff, and compelled to patronize northern manufacturers at an artificial cost, protection was one aggravating cause of sectional hostility. It could then be truly said that the South was taxed for the especial benefit of favored industries in the North.

Now southern industries naturally favor the same license to tax their customers by law. This time the sectional line is obsolete, but tariff beneficiaries have no more scruple in taxing the consumers of their own section than of any other. Southern journals voice the undemocratic desire for heavier duties, even though the southland be impoverished for a few monopolists. Hence much of the southern favor for Taft and the aid of southern congressmen for the unjust tariff.

These considerations move us to reprint the sentiments of the greatest statesman produced in the South since the formation of the Union, John C. Calhoun. Although an unswerving advocate of the slave system, his sincerity was unquestioned, and, while northern anti-slavery men lamented that so much intellect and character should be cast on the side of a fated institution, they accorded to the great Carolinian a respect denied to compromisers of adjustable convictions like Henry Clay.

On the question of protection, however, Calhoun's instinct and reason were flawless, because they were on the side of freedom and equal rights. The extracts from his writings on an another page should be read and copied by southern editors, not all of whom have bent the knee to the tariff Baal.

* * *

BOUND VOLUMES

It is our purpose to bind in cloth a limited number of sets of the Free Trade Broadside, which can be obtained by order, deliverable when ready. Price two dollars, and expressage. Librarians will find the compendium worth preserving.

* * *

BOOK NOTICES

The A B C of Taxation

The A B C of Taxation, by Charles B. Fillebrown, of Boston, published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, is a timely and thorough discussion of the subject, based on sound principles, clear in statement and admirably illustrated with pictorial object lessons. Amid the outpour of evasive and opportunist writing on the subject, this little volume stands out with refreshing distinctness. It touches the fundamentals and deserves careful reading. The publishers' price is \$1.20.

* * *

Free Trade in Being

Free Trade in Being is the title of a small volume written by Russell Rea, M.P. It is a collection of various addresses and articles bearing upon the present protectionist struggle in Great Britain. It meets and answers the specious arguments of the "tariff reformers" and vindicates the wisdom of England's present policy. The book is full of telling facts and is readable from first to last. It is published by Macmillan & Co., London. The League can furnish copies for eighty cents.

* * *

The Tariff and the Farmer

The Tariff and the Farmer, by S. Payson Perry, of Worcester, Mass., is an excellent and much needed treatment of the subject from the farmer's standpoint. No workers in the community are more victimized by the tariff than those engaged in agricultural pursuits. Among them especially the pamphlet should be widely circulated. Its price is fifty cents, postpaid. For sale by the League.

* * *

The Passing of the Tariff

It requires a sanguine author to choose the above title, but such is the subject of the inspiring book by Raymond L. Bridgman, the well-known Boston correspondent of the Springfield Republican, and author of "World Organization" and other works. Here we have the ethical treatment of a subject usually pre-empted by economic writers, to many of whom the mention of ethics is an offence. Mr. Bridgman grasps the vital truth that any system which denies the supremacy of the moral law is built on shifting sands.

Instead of lacking interest, because differentiated from current works of the so-called practical kind, "The Passing of the Tariff" compels attention and imparts a glow to the reader, so earnest is the appeal and so sincere is the author in his effort to change mistaken convictions. Therefore the moral and religious faculties of men are addressed with an unshaken confidence in their response. This is done in a manner neither didactic nor dull, calculated to stimulate reflection and light up an important branch of the "dismal science." Were this a review instead of a book-notice we should be tempted to offer a critical comment on some economic points, but they are incidental and weigh nothing against the fine spirit and purpose of the book. It is published by Sherman, French & Co. of Boston. Price \$1.20.

THE CLIMAX OF PROTECTION

Protection has reached its climax. Its giant strength is already enmeshed in the subtle and strong web of forces which will bind its hands and feet, which will overmaster its struggles, which will put an end to its selfish and unwise activity, and will finally strangle its life out altogether. Its doom is inevitable, as certain as there is progress among men. Slavery in the United States was at its zenith when it fell to its utter destruction. It dominated the politics of the country. It stifled men's consciences, as far as political majorities were concerned, even in such a pioneer anti-slavery state as Massachusetts. It paralyzed their courage and it made even its opponents, except the leaders, accept compromises rather than stand up and fight. The dollar was supreme over the bodies and souls of black men. What has happened once may happen again. It would not be strange if the next rebellion against the obstruction of trade, against the promoter of monopoly and against the imposer of unjust taxes should be successful.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, in *The Passing of the Tariff*.

WHERE EVERY PENNY COUNTS

By IDA M. TARBELL

Extracts from Article in American Magazine for March

The last man to be heard from at tariff hearings in this country is the man who buys the goods. When somebody does try to represent him he generally is laughed at for his pains. "What's the use?" is Mr. Dalzell's protest, when the advocate of the consumer appears. "Oh, let him run down," his sneer, if the advocate insists that it is his right to say what he thinks about duties which make his necessities dearer. A recurring note in the hearings recently held in Washington was contempt for the suggestion that this or that duty made an article cost a cent or two more at retail. What was a cent to a consumer!

What is a cent to a consumer? Are there a considerable number of people in this country living on incomes so small that a rise of a cent or two in the price of articles of food and clothing can make a material difference to them?

Some two years ago Joseph Jacobs published in this magazine (March, 1907) a study into the condition of what he called the Middle American. In this article he estimated that there are fully 7,000,000 families of wage earners in this country on a medium wage of \$436 a year, and 5,000,000 farmers whose average income is about \$350 a year. It is certain that there are not over 2,000,000 families of the 15,000,000 which make up our white population with over \$2,000 a year to live on. That is, the vast majority of American families live on \$500 or less a year. In the most prosperous of all our industries, that of iron and steel, the industry which has yielded the largest crop of millionaires and which has the greatest number of employes on salaries of from \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year, the average wage in 1900 was about \$540. In 1905 it had risen to about \$580.

If one is to take care of a family of five persons in New York City on \$500 a year, or of himself on a wage of \$6 or \$8 a week, he must think before he buys a penny newspaper and he must save and plan for months to get a yearly holiday for the family at Coney Island, that there is practically no possibility of a nest egg or of schooling for the children beyond fourteen years of age, that sickness means debt or charity and that the accumulation of those things which make for comfort and beauty in a home is out of the question. To these families an increase of a cent in the price of a quart of milk, as happened a year ago in New York, is something like a catastrophe. To these girls every penny added to the cost of food, of coal, of common articles of clothing, means simply less food,

less warmth, less covering, when at the best they never can have enough of any one of those necessities. These budgets are a powerful demonstration that the rapid rise in the cost of living in the last decade has been to a vast number of people of this country nothing less than a tragedy, for what is true in New York City is equally true in Chicago, in Pittsburg, and in many factory towns.

The Rise in the Cost of Living

That living has soared rapidly upward in the last ten years does not need statistical proof. Common experience is enough for most of us. Yet the figures are interesting. For instance, take what the bulletin of the Labor Bureau calls the "annual per capita cost of the necessities of daily consumption." It rose from \$74.31 in 1896 to \$107.26 in 1906. Coal which cost \$3.50 a ton in 1896 cost \$4.50 in 1906. Manufactured commodities were 32 per cent. higher in 1906 than ten years before. What one called raw commodities, 50 per cent. higher. "All commodities" averaged 35.4 per cent. higher. Rents have soared everywhere. That wages have increased largely in many industries in this decade is equally true, but that they have increased correspondingly in any but the most favored industries—those where either the Unions exercised compelling power or those where the managers were unusually enlightened—is doubtful. The last government bulletin on wages covers an investigation into about 4,000 establishments, employing 334,000 persons, engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries, the kind of establishments where, of course, the forces which raise wages act most freely and successfully. This bulletin shows that in 1906 the weekly wages of the 334,000 were 19.1 per cent. higher than in 1896—while, as said, the cost of all commodities was 35 per cent. higher. Wages increased 3.9 per cent. in 1906 over 1905, while the cost of commodities increased 5.9 per cent. Now what does this mean? Why simply this, that at a time when wealth is rolling up as never before—(this country increased its wealth between 1900 and 1904 by about twenty billions of dollars)—a vast number of hard-working people in this country are really having a more difficult time making ends meet than they have ever had before. It also means that in a great number of other hard-working families the increase in wages has been so little in excess of the increase in the cost of living that it may be almost said to be a discouragement instead of a comfort by intensifying the common conviction of the workingman that no

matter how much he earns he will still have to spend it all in the same hard struggle to get on, that there is no such thing for him as getting ahead.

Why Shoes Have Gone Up

It was hard enough for the poor to buy shoes ten years ago before the Dingley tariff, but with every year since it has been harder. In woman's ordinary shoes there has been an increase of something like 25 per cent. over the average price in the years from 1890 to 1899. There has been a corresponding increase in all varieties of boots and shoes. Say that it has been 20 per cent. and see what that means to your family of four which can spend but \$40 a year on clothes and must put \$11.81 of it on shoes.

But why should shoes increase in cost? They ought to decrease, such has been the extraordinary advance in shoe machinery and in methods. Everybody knows, too, that the industry has nothing to fear from the foreigner. He does not make shoes that the American will wear unless it be the rare brogan. But in spite of our skill and inventions, which should make it easier for everybody to buy boots and shoes, we have made it harder. This hardship comes largely from the tariff laid on hides in 1897 by the Dingley Bill. And why a tariff on hides? Simply to compel the American shoemaker to pay more for his leather. For twenty-five years hides had been free and cheap, for South America sent us large quantities. The shoe dealers were taking all both markets offered. But the cattle-growers of the West raised a cry that they should have more money for their hides, that Congress should pass a law which would compel the people to give it to them.

The duty on hides is simply another of the innumerable "bargains" in our tariff schedules. The effect of the duty was immediately to raise the price of sole leather. In June, 1906, W. L. Douglas, ex-Governor of Massachusetts, a shoe manufacturer, said in a public speech that since 1897 the increase to his company in the price of sole leather in a single pair of shoes had amounted to 17½ cents. Mr. Douglas figures that the present tariff on hides and soles causes the people of this country to pay \$30,000,000 a year more for shoes than is necessary, and they pay that perhaps 85,000 stock-raisers, herders and drovers may get more for their cattle. But how much have they gotten from it? It was argued that with the duty they could monopolize the domestic trade and cut off the South American trader, but that gentleman sent us more hides in 1906 than in any year since the duty was imposed!

Moreover, it has not been the cattle raiser who was chiefly or proportionately profited in the higher price. It has been the Beef Trust as Mr. Blaine said it would be. The cattleman has received no such increase in the price of his steers as the beef men have in the price of hides. In November, 1907, the *Hide and Leather Journal*, commenting on the good thing the Trust had always made out of this particular duty, declared it was paying stock-raisers \$12.50 apiece for cows, and selling the hides alone for \$9 apiece!

Is this fair? Are the ones to consider first in this matter of hides the Beef Trust, the Leather Trust—the Upper Leather Trust—the 85,000 cattlemen and the 300,000 or so workers in leather, or are the ones to consider first the toiling millions living on a wage where every penny counts?

The Inequalities of a Wool Tariff

But it is not only in the matter of shoes that the tariff has laid a terrible extra burden on our millions of families, on our tens of thousands of factory and shop girls, on meager incomes, the burden extends to all sorts of articles of clothing. Suppose one of these women would make herself a gown of alpaca. She must pay nearly, if not quite, twice as much a yard as she did ten years ago. Cashmere has increased fully 25 per cent. Woolen underwear, yarn to knit stockings and mittens, all kinds of suitings show a similar increase. Ten years ago our families might perhaps have bought warm garments and warm blankets, but they cannot do it to-day. And why? Because free wool was taken from us in 1897. Revenue needed? Has the United States come to such straits that in order to raise a few millions of revenue it must take woolen blankets off the beds of half its inhabitants and warm underwear off millions of children?

We must have a tariff to keep up our sheep? We raised 38,000,000 sheep in 1896 under free wool, 50,000,000 ten years later. But is an increase of 12,000,000 sheep a sufficient return for what it costs the poor of the country to support them? I know that it is claimed that so-called woolen articles at the price of 1896 can be found; that is, there are still 50-cent gloves, \$1 underwear. Alpaca, cashmere, etc., at the old prices. That is true. *But what is conceded in price is taken out of quality.* The deterioration in quality is one of the commonest complaints of thrifty shoppers. The fact is that all the great woolen factories make articles of common wear—gloves, undergarments, clothes, blankets—to look like old standard grades, but in many of them there is little if any wool. The price is what the customer had been used to but he gets neither the durability nor the warmth that he used to. While this deterioration in quality is

not confined to woolen articles by any means, it is there it causes the greatest suffering to the poor.

It is hard enough that our millions of families should bear this tax on their clothing, but it is an outrageous injustice that the tax imposed on the articles they can buy is in many cases much heavier than that imposed on the articles the rich buy. Last year Mr. Jesse F. Orton of the Reform League, made a comparative study of the tax on the different grades of necessary articles of clothing. He found that on certain gloves the poor man paid a tax of 66.28 per cent., but the man with money paid only 14.19 per cent. That is, a glove worth \$4.53 a dozen carried a tariff of \$3.00 a dozen—a glove worth \$31 a dozen paid a tax of \$4.40 per dozen! On the poor man's knit fabrics there is a duty of 141 per cent., on the rich man's 95.67 per cent.; on the poor man's winter flannels one of 143.67 per cent., on the rich man's one of 86.39 per cent.; on the worsted cloth of the one a duty of 134.97 per cent., on that of the other 94.3 per cent.; on the woolen blankets of the poor a duty of 165.42 per cent., on those of the rich 71.30 per cent.

The Beneficence of the Thread Trust

The poor woman of to-day not only sees herself cut off from wool clothing and covering, she finds herself pinched by the steady increase in the price of everything which goes into keeping the scanty articles she can buy in order. She must have thread. Spool cotton is as necessary an article of daily consumption in the household as fuel or cloth. Many women with families, on \$500 a year, many shop and factory girls on \$6 or \$8 a week, make their own clothes. Not infrequently these women in their work are obliged, when not protected by a Union, to furnish their own thread. Miss Ainslee found one cap-worker in New York last year spending an average of 75 cents a week for thread for her work out of an average wage of \$8 a week. For many years the price of the ordinary 200-yard spool cotton had been 5 cents, twelve spools for 50 cents, when suddenly in 1900 it was advanced to 6 cents, about double the price it was selling for in England.

Furniture and Tinware

Of course in the schedule of \$600 or less there are few items of furniture. The income will not permit it. Where a family is setting up housekeeping or where wear and tear has made new articles necessary they do appear, but the relation of the sum spent to the whole income is pathetic in the extreme. One family of three spent \$45 on furniture out of an income of \$489. They were obliged to make this expenditure because they were starting. In another family of nine living on an income of \$1,500 which was most intelligently spent, only \$33 was eked out for furni-

ture. In another of two on \$689, \$11.93.

It is obvious very little can be bought at best, but in many cases that little is much less than it would have been ten years ago. A table which in 1896 could have been bought at wholesale for \$13.80 cost \$16.50 in 1906. Common maple chairs increased from \$6 to \$8.91 a dozen at wholesale. Ash bed-room sets from \$8.75 to \$12.95. All kinds of wooden ware was much dearer. But what can be expected? They have gone up with the materials from which they are made. Free lumber brought all of these articles down under the Wilson Bill. The restoration of the duty by the Dingley Bill sent them up, and yet those who plead for duties always assure us that we will get our goods cheaper under the tariff. That was Mr. McKinley's plea and promise when he put through the duty on tin plate. But how has it worked for the consumer through the eighteen years since we gave it to him? The McKinley Bill put the tariff on tin plate at 2 1-5 cents per pound. The immediate effect was to raise the price of tin plate from 15 to 20 per cent. Every housewife remembers how tin dishes of all sorts went up after the McKinley Bill was passed. Indeed if we could analyze causes down to the bottom no small influence in electing Mr. Cleveland in 1892 would be found to be due to the higher price which every farmer's wife paid the traveling peddler for pie plates and dippers!

The Standard Oil Company has been, for many years, probably the largest single consumer of tin plate in the country—practically all of the oil it sends to the Orient being put into tin cans which it manufactures itself from imported plate. Now one of the many curious features of our tariff laws is the system of drawbacks by which the duty on imported materials made into goods for export is rebated. These rebates or drawbacks are paid on many things but the amount is insignificant excepting in two or three cases. Out of drawbacks aggregating something like five and a quarter millions in 1900 and five and three-quarters in 1906 by far the largest item was tin plate—\$1,848,792 in the former year, \$2,252,381.82 in the latter. That is, the man who in 1906 manufactured tin cans to sell to his countrymen paid about 20 per cent. more for his material than the Standard Oil Company paid for what it manufactured to sell to the foreigner. Of course the home consumer of tin pails and milk pans paid the higher cost. But why we should be taxed to build up a tin plate industry at home, and the Standard Oil Company be free from the tax does not seem quite clear.

What it Costs a People to Create an Industry

To be sure as a result of taxing ourselves we have a tin plate industry in

the United States. In 1900 as a result of the high prices of the decade preceding 57 tin plate establishments had grown up where ten years before there were none. These 57 establishments employed about 4,000 people and turned out near \$32,000,000 worth of goods. In 1905 the industry had grown to a product of something over \$35,000,000 and employed about 5,000 people. In order to build up this industry, secure this product, provide places for these workmen, it has been estimated that we taxed ourselves between 1890 and 1900 fully \$90,000,000. Taxed ourselves \$90,000,000 and let off our largest single consumer scot free. We also have been selling abroad the tin plate we manufacture here at considerably less price than at home. And now observe how in the case of tin plate the protected American manufacturer gets even on this lower price to the foreigner. He takes it out of the laborer—that is, the wages of tin plate workers are reduced 25 per cent. on tin plate made for export. The Standard Oil trust gets its duties rebated on export work and the tin plate workers get their wages cut!

Bargains for Foreigners

One of the most exasperating features of the tariff as it is now working out—one most unjust to the poor—is that while we are paying these high prices at home our protected manufacturers are supplying Englishmen and Frenchmen and Chinamen with the same articles at prices from 10 to 70 per cent. lower! Indeed the Dingley Bill had not been long in operation before the administration itself warned the iron and steel people officially that they were in danger of giving the game away if they continued to sell steel rails, for months together, to foreigners for \$22 a ton, while they charged their compatriots \$35. But the warning seems to have had little effect. Frank manufacturers like Mr. Schwab have said, of course we sell cheaper to foreigners. We must—not only that but we sell materials to our fellow manufacturers cheaper when they are to be turned into goods for foreigners than we do when they are to be turned into goods for our own people!

So sweeping is this practice that the Tariff Reform Committee declared after an investigation of the export trade for the year ending in June, 1900, that of \$452,000,000 exports of that year 85 to 90 per cent. were sold on an average of 20 per cent. lower than at home. It sometimes seems as if the great American system for making the foreigner pay the duty had resulted in presenting it to the foreigner. He buys our goods cheaper than we can buy them, and like Mr. Coats he establishes his factory here and protected from world competition drives our own manufacturers into his combination, runs the business from the other side of the waters and charges us twice as much as he can his countrymen!

Admitting if you will that it *was* just to make the people of this country, on \$2 a day and less, pay the major share of the cost of the Civil War, the cost of reconstruction, the cost of establishing all sorts of industries and protecting them through long terms of years from the competition of the world, has the time not come when the Committee on Ways and Means can be asked to consider without sneering, at least, the burden which the protective tariff places to-day on millions of American families—tens of thousands of lonely working women living on incomes where every penny counts?

THE FIRST STEP COSTLY

If the British manufacturing interests, which are the backbone of the (protectionist) movement can once get their general tariff, however moderate, the needs of public revenue will be subordinated to their pockets. A British revival of agriculture, imperial unity, and all the other pretty phrases will go to the board, and a naked domination of greed and plunder, Protection in its proper historic meaning, will be fastened on the necks of our people. Not only is the Conservative Party and its organization solidly committed to Protection, but Mr. Balfour, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Milner, and now Lord Curzon, stand for Protection as "the first constructive work of the Unionist Party."—*The Nation, London.*

THE YOUNG TO THE OLD

You who are old,
And have fought the fight,
And have won or lost or left the field,
Weigh us not down
With fears of the world, as we run!
With the wisdom that is too right,
The warning to which we cannot yield,
The shadow that follows the sun
Follows forever—
And with all that desire must leave undone,
Though as a god it endeavor,
Weigh, weigh us not down!

But gird our hope to believe
That all that is done
Is done by dream and daring—
Bid us dream on!
The earth was not born
Or Heaven built of bewareing—
Yield us the dawn!
You dreamt your hour—and dared, but
we
Would dream till all you despaired of
be,
Would dare, till the world,
Won to a new wayfaring,
Be thence forever easier upward
drawn!

—Cale Young Rice, *American Magazine.*

PROTECTION TO FARMERS

(Adapted from the French of Bastiat.)

A poor farmer of Pennsylvania raised with great care and attention, a fine crop of wheat, and forgot, in the joy of his success, how many drops of sweat the precious grain had cost him. "I will sell some," said he to his wife, "and with the proceeds I will buy carpet for our bare floors." The honest countryman, arriving in Philadelphia, there met an American and an Englishman. "Give me your wheat," said the American, "and I will give you 75 yards of carpet." The Englishman said: "Give it to me, and I will give you 100 yards, for we Englishmen can make cheaper carpets than Americans can, for our wool is not taxed." But a custom house officer, standing by, said to the countryman: "My good fellow, make your exchange if you choose, with the American, but my duty is to prevent your doing so with the Englishman." "What!" exclaimed the countryman, "do you wish me to take 75 yards of American carpet, when I can have 100 yards from England?" "Certainly. Do you not see that America would be a loser, if you were to receive 100 yards instead of 75?" "I can scarcely understand this," said the laborer. "Nor can I explain it," said the custom house officer, "but there is no doubt of the fact, for Congressmen and editors all agree that a people is impoverished in proportion as it receives a large compensation for any given quantity of its produce."

Having been protected from the Englishman, the countryman was obliged to conclude his bargain with the American. His wife carpeted three rooms instead of four. These good people are still puzzling themselves to discover how it can happen that people are ruined by receiving four instead of three, and why they are richer with 75 yards than with 100.

The next year the farmer voted for "Protection"—as usual. He wondered why he could not make ends meet—as usual.—*Samuel Milliken, Phila. Record.*

AN AUTHORITY ON THE BEEF TRUST

Washington, April 10, 1890.

Dear Mr. McKinley:—It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It is a slap in the face of the South Americans, with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade. *It will benefit the farmer by adding five to eight per cent. to the price of his children's shoes.*

It will yield a profit to the butcher (Beef Trust) only, the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end—in every form and phase.

Please stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican party only into speedy retirement.

Very hastily,

James G. Blaine.

PERSONAL VS. PUBLIC INTERESTS

Not only do selfish private interests nominate and elect congressmen and influence their course in regard to legislation, but congressmen themselves do not blush to have it known that they are personally and pecuniarily interested in the levying of certain tariff duties for which they vote as public legislators and for which they work and lobby with all the skill at their command.

If we had a high and honest standard of public morals in congress it would be much easier to get an honest tariff, and the consumer would not be plundered as he is now. Whatever may be said of the personal character of congressmen, I venture to say that the established moral code in congress, recognized as governing in public or official matters, is lower than that which prevails in most city councils. Here is the proof: There are few city councils in which a member is allowed to vote upon any contract or other question in which he is known to have a pecuniary interest, and in many cities all members of the council are absolutely forbidden to have any pecuniary interest in any contract awarded by that body. In Washington it is common gossip that out of the nineteen members of the ways and means committee who will frame a new tariff various ones are pecuniarily interested in this or that schedule, that one is interested in tobacco, another in olives, a third in lumber, and so on.

Some of the pecuniary tariff interests of congressmen, past and present, cropped out at the hearings. Ex-Representative Rhodes of Missouri told how he had introduced a bill in a former congress increasing the duty on barytes while he was personally engaged in producing that mineral. Representative Fordney stated that he was engaged in the manufacturing of lumber, and he bitterly opposed all proposals to remove the tax from this "shelter" material in the interest of 80,000,000 consumers and for the conservation of the country's forests. Mr. Fordney did not state whether he has any interest in oil. But in spite of the notorious petroleum "joker" in the present tariff, which gives the trust extreme protection, he made the statement that "there is not any duty at all" on oil. That a congressional tariff maker should not know of the existence of the duties on petroleum and its products is surprising.

When the judges who are commissioned to sit at Washington and judge impartially between tariff burdened consumers and tariff protected producers not only represent selfish interests, but are themselves pecuniarily interested in their own decision, what wonder is it that the consumer's interests are ignored? So far as moral quality is concerned, ex-Senator Bur-

ton's act in representing private interests before one of the government departments during his term as a senator, for which he was sent to prison, was mild and harmless as compared with acts which are openly committed by members of congress in tariff legislation. The one has been made criminal by statute; the others have not.

The prospect of relief for consumers from unequal and unjust tariff burdens unfortunately is clouded by the apparent necessity of raising revenue from import duties. Taxation of citizens in proportion to their expenditures for one or more articles of use is indefensible so far as justice in distributing the burdens of government is concerned. But the federal constitution practically closes many of the avenues of legitimate taxation, and the supreme court has by construction closed certain others. Thus fortified in some measure by legal necessity as well as by private cupidity, the system of raising revenue from tariffs will be continued for the present. The substitution of a better plan is hindered not only by the avowed advocates of the protective theory, for whom tariff revenue is merely a convenient by-product, but also by many professed opponents of protection who do not scruple to secure under plea of the necessities of the revenue protection for some pet industry and also by consistent opponents of protection who cannot see that revenue tariff taxes are unjust in themselves and are among the most effective supports of the protective system.

—Jesse F. Orton, in the *N. Y. Independent*.

LINCOLN

And how shall we, my friends, best honor him? What ends,

What aims, what aspirations make our own?

What cause would he approve with his great human love,

Now his revered republic is full grown?

With beauty we must store the good world more and more,

This very day be artists, every one, Till we have longed and wrought with truth in every thought,

And without gladness not a hand's turn done.

And what does this imply? What part have you and I

With Lincoln and the cause of liberty?

Are there no slaves to-day? While we sit here at play,

Have we no brothers in adversity?

None sorry nor oppressed, who without hope or rest

Must toil and have no pleasure in their toil?

These are your slaves and mine. Where is the right divine

Of idlers to encumber God's good soil?

—Selected.

THE BENEFICENT LAW OF SERVICE FOR SERVICE

The greatest evil arising from the tariff is not financial but moral, not materialistic but spiritual. We could possibly afford to build trusts and amass fortunes at the one social extreme and degrading poverty at the other; we could possibly afford to permit one class to legally filch the earnings of another, and compel the fruits of industry to fall into the lap of luxury; we could possibly afford to do all this, I say, bad as these things are, but we cannot afford to place in jeopardy the ancient and righteous principles of service for service, and set up in place thereof that villainous idea of getting something for nothing. And that is what the tariff has done.

Man, whether related or not, is still like enough the ape in that he learns best and quickest by imitation; and, when the great horde of respectable gentlemen—beneficiaries of privileges—are seen to pile up wealth without apparent effort, and certainly without adequate return, what is more natural than that others should seek to do likewise? And so the time of our legislative bodies is largely taken up by men demanding privileges of one kind and another, or in attempting to frame laws which may minimize the evils resulting from privileges already held. And the briber and the grafter are but the inevitable result—the natural product of the system. * * *

The question in the tariff is one not of rates and percentages but of principle. When will man learn that privilege is impossible without plunder? So long as we fail to learn this, so long shall we fail to catch even the keynote of reform, and, however earnest may be our efforts, they can but produce discord and confusion. For, privilege being the tap-root of monopoly, is the antithesis of equality, and without equality of opportunity brotherhood, the hope of the age, can be but an evanescent dream. It is the old, old story, the force of which none knew better than man's arch-enemy (excepting only his Conqueror) when as a last resort He said, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship Me."—*J. S. Maclean, in the Ohio State Journal*.

NO EARNEST EFFORT WASTED

Though our best-directed efforts may often seem wasted and lost, nothing coming of them that can be pointed to and distinctly identified as a definite gain to humanity; though this may happen ninety-nine times in every hundred, the hundredth time the result may be so great and dazzling that we had never dared to hope for it, and should have regarded him who had predicted it to us as sanguine beyond the bounds of mental sanity.—*John Stuart Mill*.

WHY COLLEGE GRADUATES RENOUNCE FREE TRADE TEACHINGS

One presumption against the tariff stands as a rock in a tide, though it is often completely buried by the rush of waters. It is the permanent and well-known fact that the most thorough investigations and studies of the colleges and universities pronounce in favor of unobstructed trade as the wisest policy for a nation to pursue. Protectionists who send their sons to college do not expect that they will accept the teaching of free trade authorities. College graduates who become protectionists renounce, if they cannot disprove, the teachings of their professors. In this field alone, of all subjects of thorough research and reflection, the logical processes of the human mind are deliberately and persistently rejected as worthless, though this is an age when the triumph of mind is most loudly proclaimed. In the United States, the power of wealth, as well as the power of votes, has been on the side of the doctrine of obstruction of trade by a tariff, to the discredit of the human intellect, as illustrated by trained thinkers in this particular field. Probably there is no other instance so conspicuous where the judgment of the expert is thrown aside and the opinion of selfish interests substituted.

But the weight of the tariff profits cannot forever keep the lid of agitation down. The explosive power of the restrained forces of justice and sound public policy increases by repression, for they are forces which are eternally active in their very nature, and the clattering of the lid which they constantly produce compels the attention of the men who would persuade the public that no other policy is right than that the people should be taxed in order that out of the product of the taxes a portion may be returned to a part of the public, while the tariff beneficiaries retain the remainder.

—Raymond L. Bridgman, in *The Passing of the Tariff*.

"EQUALIZING DUTIES"

The proposed duty on tea is criticised by protectionists who complain that "it is a burden imposed on hard-working men, and it does not protect an industry." One is justified in inferring that they would cease complaining, if a portion of the workingmen's burden should serve to protect some industry. Assuming that the duty on tea would produce a revenue of \$6,000,000, the inference is that protectionists would not complain, if \$2,000,000 were paid to the government, and \$4,000,000 paid to the owners of an industry.

Woollens are protected by a duty of more than 75 per cent., but nevertheless some woollens are imported. To impose a duty on tea and, at the same time, to satisfy those protectionists who are willing to burden "hard work-

ing men" provided it will protect an industry, it seems that the protective policy might be broadened by imposing a duty of eight cents a pound on tea, and amending the clause by a proviso that \$4,000,000 of the revenue thus obtained shall be given to the woollen industry to further protect it. With this \$4,000,000 the woollen industry could employ 10,000 operatives at wages higher than is now paid. It does not matter to the "hard working men" whether they protect the woollen industry by a burdensome tax on woollens or on tea.

One of the purposes of the Payne Tariff bill, as described in its title, is "to equalize duties." What that means may be explained by the representatives in discussing the bill, and, until such explanation, we can only surmise, which we now do.

The hard working man buys tea that costs abroad 16 cents a pound, and a duty of 8 cents a pound makes his tax 50 per cent. The man who does not work hard buys tea costing abroad 80 cents a pound, and a duty of 8 cents makes his tax 10 per cent. The equation is this: A tax of 50 per cent. on workingmen's tea equals a tax of 10 per cent. on tea of those who do not have to work, or perhaps it is this; a rich man spends 80 cents for tea and pays 8 cents to the government, while a workingman spending 80 cents for tea pays 40 cents to the government; therefore, a rich man's 8 cents equals a poor man's 40 cents in paying government expenses.

But perhaps "to equalize duties" will be explained thus: a tax of 75 per cent. on hosiery, paid to the manufacturer, equals a duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, not paid to the farmer. We wait for explanation.

—George Brickett, in the *N. Y. Evening Post*.

AN OXFORD SCHOLAR ON FREE TRADE

The merchants did much to break down the everlasting jealousy and strife between nations into peaceful and profitable intercourse. Moreover it may be plainly proved that the old hostile system of nations is kept up by every kind of restriction on trade, every protective duty imposed to force the production of commodities in countries ill-suited to them, to prevent their coming in cheap and good from where they are raised with least labor. There is no agent of civilization more beneficial than the free trader, who gives the inhabitants of every region the advantages of all other regions, and whose business is to work out the law that what serves the general profit of mankind serves also the private profit of the individual.

—Edward Burnett Tylor (*Anthropology*).

COWPER AND FREE TRADE

To the Editor of *The Nation*. (London.)
Sir,—Permit me, as an old Free Trader—one who took part in the Anti-Corn Law Agitation and knew Cobden and Bright—to call your attention to the words of the poet Cowper, expressing clearly the principles that are the basis of Free Trade. Free Trade means free intercourse between the nations of the earth, and, as Cobden once beautifully wrote, "Free Trade—the international common law of the Almighty."

These sentiments are poetically expressed by Cowper in his poem on "Charity":—

Again—the band of commerce was design'd
To associate all the branches of mankind;
And if a boundless plenty be the robe,
Trade is the golden girdle of the globe.
Wise to promote whatever end He means,
God opens fruitful Nature's various scenes;
Each climate needs what other climes produce,
And offers something to the general use;
No land but listens to the common call,
And in return receives supply from all.
This genial intercourse and mutual aid,
Cheers what were else an universal shade;
Calls Nature from her ivy-mantled den,
And softens human rock-work into men.

How different these principles are compared with the jealousies entertained by Tariff Reformers (Protectionists) towards foreign nations. There is no doubt that hostile tariffs would excite jealousy amongst other people. One of the reasons, why foreign nations are disposed to acquiesce in the possession by this country of such a large share of the habitable portion of the earth is that we indulge in no preferential tariffs nor exclusive dealing. England grants no privileges to her own people in respect to trade and commerce which are not equally accorded to the people of all other countries.

Free Trade is the handmaid of peace, and it is very significant that the Tariff Reformers (Protectionists) are generally the people who cry out for increased armaments. How inferior are these jealousies compared with the spirit of Tennyson's lines:—

Ah! when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule and universal peace,
Lie like a shaft of light across the land?

—Ralph S. Ashton.

February, 1909.

What though the soul be vexed? She can forget
Cares of an hour; only the great things last.

—Lionel Johnson.

BYRON W. HOLT ON TARIFF ROBBERY

Extracts from an Address, Providence, R. I., February 6.

If the people of this country should suddenly wake up to the fact that they are paying an average of over \$20 apiece or about \$100 per family per year in tariff taxes and that five-sixths of what they pay goes to fatten our protected trusts and to create "malefactors of wealth," a revolution would be begun before to-morrow morning that would not stop until it had abolished custom houses and made trade between this country and other countries as free as our constitution makes it between our states. They would not be long on the job. They would double discount the alacrity of the Boston Tea Party.

What would happen right here in Providence, if your merchants should advertise and sell goods at their real, ex-tariff, values, and customs' officials should then try to collect the tariff taxes of you before you could get your goods out of the stores? How many policemen and detectives would have to be stationed at each store door to prevent you from smuggling goods out of the stores and into your homes?

Suggestive Examples

You would buy 3½ pounds of sugar for 10 cents and the tariff tax collectors at the door would ask you for 8 cents more. The collector who would represent Uncle Sam would take 6 cents and the collector who would represent the modest Sugar Trust would take 2 cents. You would buy a pound of borax for 5 cents and the tariff tax collectors at the door would ask you for 7 cents more. The Uncle Sam one would take nothing and the greedy Borax Trust one would take the whole 7 cents. Your washerwomen and laundrymen would not, of course, object to paying the 7 cents tax to swell the millions of Mr. F. M. Smith, of California, the Borax King of the world.

You would pay \$15 for a suit of clothes and \$10 for the tariff tax on it. You would pay \$1 for a keg of nails and 60 cents for the tariff tax on it. You would pay \$2 for 100 pounds of tin plate and \$1.50 for the tariff tax on it. You would pay \$1 for a Diston saw and 50 cents for the tax on it. You would pay \$25 for a Singer sewing machine and \$15 for the tax on it. You would pay \$60 for a Remington typewriter and \$40 for the tax on it. You would pay 30 cents for a Nicholson file and 20 cents for the tax on it. You would pay \$2 for a box of window glass and \$1.80 for the tax on it.

Generally, when you buy clothing, hardware or implements, you pay from 20 to 60 cents tariff tax on every dollar's worth of goods purchased. On meat, flour and vegetables, the tariff tax is very light. On most canned and bottled goods, however, the tax will average high—perhaps 25 or 30 per

cent. If you build a house, you pay duties averaging about 20 per cent. on the materials used. If you rent a house, you pay your tariff taxes with your rent. There is no escape from tariff taxes. Even many articles on the free list carry some tariff taxes because they are transported over tariff-taxed roads and stored in tariff-taxed buildings.

Seen and Unseen Taxes

How long do you think the law abiding people of Providence could sustain a custom house at every store door? How long would it take you to decide that you would prefer to pay national taxes directly and honestly, as you do your state and city taxes, instead of indirectly and insidiously as you now pay them? You might then be willing to pay \$17 per family per year to Uncle Sam. You would most certainly be unwilling to pay \$83 per family a year of tariff graft to the trusts. Your patriotic blood would boil with just indignation at the mere attempt of the protected trusts to extort such an amount from you.

What a wonderful difference between seen and unseen taxes! Why is it that the people are so easily fooled and cajoled into paying \$6 of unseen rather than \$1 of seen taxes?

If it is foolish for farmers and wage earners to vote to tax themselves unnecessarily, except for the incidental benefits of Carnegie libraries and other educational institutions, it is still more foolish for salaried and professional men to vote to enrich others at their expense.

Possibly the doctors may be excused for voting for a system that necessitates the eating of poor food, the wearing of cheap and scanty clothing, and living in tenement houses, and that encourages poverty, disease and crime. The lawyers also may find profit in the crime and corruption resulting from the extremes of poverty and wealth caused by "protection." Soldiers too may find employment in the wars between nations that are engendered by retaliatory tariffs.

How the Man from Mars Would View It

I wonder how many here have ever thought seriously on this subject. How many have attempted to analyze carefully the stock arguments that have, at different times in our history, been used to bolster up protection? How many, or rather how few, can think and reason as logically and with as little bias and prejudice as could a man from Mars who had just reached our planet and who knew nothing of our partisan prejudices and previous conditions and trainings?

Nothing would puzzle this foreigner

more than would our custom houses. He would see us spending billions of dollars on roads, railroads, canals and ships, to remove obstructions to trade and to promote the exchange of products, and then he would see us erecting, in our custom houses, greater barriers to trade and commerce than any that we had removed. "Why," he might say, "are you spending \$300,000,000 to build the Panama Canal? Would you not do more to promote trade if you would lower your tariff wall 10 per cent?"

What kind of a report would this untutored man from Mars make on his return to his native planet? It would be something like this:

"The inhabitants of Earth are an ingenious but strangely inconsistent people. They display great engineering ability in boring tunnels through mountains, in digging great canals, and in constructing railroads and building ships, to overcome the natural barriers to trade, and equally great inventive genius in raising artificial barriers to counteract the good effects of the removal of the natural barriers. They have patent ball bearings to make their wheels of commerce run easily as possible and patent brakes to make these same wheels run as hard as possible. They have great scientists and great statesmen and each class is always working industriously to counteract and nullify the work of the other. They are a great and incomprehensible people. There is a screw loose somewhere with them."

The Tariff Thieves Fall Out

What we are now witnessing at Washington is a contest between the selfish protected interests. The tariff thieves, as Mr. Charles Francis Adams calls them—and he admits that he is one of them—have simply fallen out amongst themselves. They have been stealing from each other. The big billion-dollar infants have been stealing the tariff pap from the little million-dollar infants.

The administration does not propose to abolish tariff privileges and stop the depredations of the trusts. Only a friendly revision is planned. One that will divide the tariff plunder more equitably amongst the thieves. The license to steal from the \$6,000,000 of us helpless, friendless and, economically considered, imbecile consumers will be continued. Why not?

If we give the keys of our homes to the trust-thieves and invite them to help themselves when we are not looking, can we expect them to resist the temptation? Is it not natural that they should quarrel among themselves as to who should have the first crack at our valuables? But why should their quarrels interest us? If we are to encourage thieves, why not have big

ones to whom we can point with pride?

All things considered, it is perfectly safe to say that any tariff bill that passes the next Congress will be inconsistent with Republican protectionist theories, inconsistent with sound economics and inconsistent with itself. It will continue in substantially undiminished form the tariff taxes that are now burdening our self-supporting industries, that are heavily oppressing consumers, that are reducing the purchasing power of wages and that are stifling commerce and trade and preventing this country from quickly attaining that commercial supremacy of the world to which it is fairly entitled and which it will surely attain when absolute free trade is established.

PROTECTION THE ENEMY OF REVENUE

Banker Charles C. Jackson, of Boston, carries out a recent Supreme Court decision to its logical conclusion to the annoyance of the stand-patters, when he says:

The tariff must not only supply money enough to run the government, but it must prevent importations and so cut its own throat in order to please protectionists. And now that the courts say that no "combine" which restrains trade can get the aid of the law to help it collect its ordinary business accounts, the next court decision may well be that, since a protective tariff is obviously an agreement for combination between the government and the protected manufacturers in restraint of trade, the courts will not aid the government to collect protective duties. Shall we ever get a revenue tariff and be free from such frequent recurrence of unnecessary anxieties and business depressions?

—*Eastern Argus, Me.*

WHISTLER AND FREE ART

The artist Whistler was once asked when he was coming back to America, and his reply was, "When the duty on art is removed."

A few years ago, when his paintings and etchings were being collected by the Copley Society for an exhibition, he was appealed to for assistance, but refused, saying: "God bless me! why should you hold an exhibition of pictures in America? The people do not care for art."

"How do you know? You have not been there for many years."

"How do I know? Why, haven't you a law to keep out pictures and statues? Is it not in black and white that the works of the great masters must not enter America, that they are not wanted? A people that tolerates such a law has no love for art, their protestation is mere pretence."

MORE GEMS FROM H. E. MILES.

Chairman of the Tariff Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Extracts from Address, Milwaukee, January 12

The walling in of 80,000,000 of consumers and their deliverance under an excessive rate to any who will and can "trustify" has led to the greatest exploitation of the public that has ever occurred in the history of any people.

This hurt has come not only to 80,000,000 consumers, but in no less degree to the thousands of intermediate consumers, the non-trustified competitive manufacturers who get their supplies largely from the trusts and are so over-charged as to be almost driven out of business. Steel, for instance, costs almost twice what it did when the Dingley law was enacted and the industry trustified.

An excessive tariff like the Dingley is a blow at labor. This has not been sufficiently emphasized. A reduction in the tariff to the level required by Mr. Taft's principle of measurement will give the laborers of this country three chances for a raise in wages with no chances for a decline. This raise would come: First, through a lesser cost of living; second, by increased employment, for with a lowering of prices must come an increased demand; third, higher daily wages. A manufacturer can pay his employes only a part of what is left in the till after the bills for materials are paid. A return to moderate but ample protection will increase the profits of competitive manufacturers. In such increased prosperity labor always shares.

Prohibition is not protection. An excessive tariff is usually prohibitive. It makes foreign competition impossible; the home producers eliminate competition by combination, and then have their 80,000,000 compatriots at their mercy. When, for instance, congress puts a duty of 45 per cent. upon goods I make, 15 per cent being enough, it gave congressional permit, if not a congressional invitation, that all in my industry consolidate and add to our present domestic prices the differences between the necessary 15 per cent. and the 45 per cent. given. And this is what all the trusts have done. The question whether any industry does add much, or all, the tariff to its domestic prices is answered by this other question: "Can they?" If they can, they do. The trusts can, and they do. The manufacturer under competition, cannot, and he does not.

Our tariffs have been drawn by men almost wholly inexperienced in that work. Mr. McKinley for instance was the only man of previous experience among the majority members of the committee which framed the McKinley bill. So of the Wilson bill. Only three members of the majority upon

that ways and means committee possessed previous experience and that only as minority members of the McKinley committee, where they had too great consideration for the majority even to be present when the real work was done.

And from that day to this Hon. S. E. Payne and John Dalzell have been on the committee "standing pat"—poker-playing as it were with the people's money, playing the "game" with intent to lose and losing in twelve years to the oil trust alone \$360,000,000 of the people's money, and to other trusts ten times more.

The free trade Wilson bill also gave a high protection to sugar, and the sugar people offering money in large amounts for votes. The protection given them caused sugar stocks to advance ten points in forty-eight hours. Said President Cleveland of the Wilson bill—"Bought, bought, bought."

The steel trust receives \$75,000,000 a year by getting a few congressmen and it's hard to give this up. The steel trust bought \$400,000,000 worth of property and added a billion in capital—water—and still can make a handsome profit on the \$1,400,000,000. I am not discussing or blaming the trust—but I do say it is a crime that congress should pass a law which makes the watering processes possible or legal. When congress says nothing shall be imported it gives competitors the right and the temptation to combine for the exploitation of the consumer, I don't blame a man who takes advantage of a law of the land, but I do blame the sleepy public, the consumer, which permits its representatives to make such things possible.

Look at the record of Messrs. Payne and Dalzell in tariff making. They were on the so-called free trade Wilson committee that gave to Standard oil its first protection, a protection that Rogers, himself manager of Standard oil, laughed at. They were on the next committee which in 1907 continued to Standard oil this same protection. They have battened on every industrial trust that now exists in the United States. Not once in the twelve years have they come before the people with an open statement that any single duty is radically wrong.

LESSON FROM THE PAST

The Chinese were building their great wall.

"This will prevent unjust discrimination," they said. "It will keep everything out."

Thereby, too, they saved the trouble and expense of having to revise the tariff every few years.

—*Chicago Tribune.*

VALUABLE INSTRUCTION FOR MR. TAFT

What He Failed to Learn at Yale

The Treasury situation impelled Mr. Taft to make the unusual declaration for his party that "in the making of a tariff bill the prime motive is taxation and the securing thereby of a revenue." In view of the tremendous deficit of \$130,000,000 to \$140,000,000 in the receipts of the current fiscal year, as compared with the expenditures, the framers of the tariff must, as the President says, "have in mind the total revenues likely to be produced by it, and so arrange the duties as to secure an adequate income." This cannot be done by either increasing or maintaining duties for the primary object of protection, for that implies restricting imports, and to increase revenues from customs duties it is necessary to encourage importation. Maintaining duties as they are will not yield more revenue, and raising them is likely, in most cases, to diminish it. It is only by increasing the volume of imports, by lightening the tax upon them that there is any prospect of increasing to any material extent the revenue to be derived from them. That should be the "prime motive" of revision.

Reversing the "Prime Motive"

But the President says, echoing his party platform, revision should secure an adequate revenue "and adjust the duties in such a manner as to afford to labor and to all industries in this country, whether of the farm, mine or factory, protection by tariff equal to the difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production here." Here the "prime motive" is reversed, or two prime motives are presented which are mutually destructive. It is virtually assumed that in all the industries of the country there is a greater cost of production here than abroad, and that they need to be and can be protected from foreign competition by a duty on foreign products equal to the difference. If this were the case the economic state of this country would be sad, indeed. It would have the home market all to itself, the ancient ideal of protectionism, but it would have no other market, for its products would cost too much for the poor foreigners to buy, and they would not be permitted to pay for them in products of their own cheap labor.

But allowing that the principle so broadly stated is meant to apply only

to industries in this country in which production is proved actually to cost more than abroad, how are we to ascertain which these are and to what extent production costs more in each and so adjust duties for their protection? Cost of production involves various things, natural resources and conditions, labor, enterprise, capable management and economic facilities. It is not measured by wages, the price of land or materials or any of the factors shown in statistics. Its essence is the consumption of products in the process of getting them out, and the real "difference" to be considered is that between the output in different countries for the exertion bestowed upon production. The country that has the advantage is that in which a certain amount of effort applied by its people in various industries yields the largest product, and that is sure to be the country of highest wages and lowest labor cost. Apparent difference of cost in wages, price of materials and interest on capital is unstable and delusive. It is no evidence of the need of protection or proper measure of it if it is needed. Those who produce most with least labor and highest efficiency are the least in need of protection. Nobody needs protection against the rivalry of inferiors.

A Fallacious and Delusive Principle

"All industries" cannot be protected, for one or some can only be protected at the expense of others. The farm and mine in this country produce on the whole more abundantly and more cheaply than in other countries, and they produce a surplus over the requirements of the home market. This is sold abroad in competition with foreign products of a similar kind, which determines its price. Duties do not protect or benefit industries. If the factory benefits by protection, it is by forcing the domestic market to pay more for its products, and the consumers engaged in other industries pay the price. The foreigner does not. So far as the factory can sell abroad at a profit, it is proof that its cost of production is not greater than that abroad, whatever its rate of wages may be. It is only as the result of trying that ability to stand competition can be tested. It cannot be calculated beforehand and the need of protection against it be gauged, and if that is done arbitrarily and artificially

the chief spur to effort and incentive to progress will be removed. The avowed principle upon which Mr. Taft is urging his "good faith" revision of the tariff and upon which his party promised it is fallacious and delusive. The sooner they get through with it the better, but there will be no genuine or enduring revision until the sound principle is adopted of giving force and vitality to competition instead of paralyzing it. All we can hope for this spring is some mitigation of an oppressive tariff, and what we have to fear is a new irritant in a maximum and minimum scale devised for retaliation against those who have been provoked to retaliate against our general policy.—*N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*

ROOSEVELT AND THE TARIFF

View of a Distinguished German

Mr. Roosevelt has confined himself to expressing in very lively language, and with a good display of temperament, his displeasure at the abuses in the economical conditions of his country. But while he has voiced the popular dissatisfaction, he himself has contributed little that is essential to heal the disease of which he complains.

His embittered fight against trusts has deepened the general opinion that something must be done to hew off some of the arms of this octopus; but nothing has been done by him. Roosevelt has proved himself a political moralist, but he has not shown himself a constructive statesman. He has looked at the thing from far too narrow a point of view. Notwithstanding his moralist's hatred of the trusts, he has failed to see that there is an intimate connection between these exploiting trusts and the protectionism which dominates America. This is what makes one think that there is an element of the unreal in Roosevelt's policy. When public opinion in America begins to strike the balance with regard to Roosevelt's reign they will come to the conclusion, "Much cry and little wool."—*Dr. Theodore Barth.*

Those who are proposing to shut out a quantity of our imports in order to have similar goods made at home are proclaiming that they want import duties by way of raising revenue—that is to say, the goods are not to be kept out, but to come in! Thus does the protectionist theory reel and gyrate, flying from pillar to post, doubling, confuting itself, contradicting itself, constant only in confidence of asseveration.—*Trade and Tariffs, John M. Robertson M. P.*

CURRENT PRESS OPINIONS ON THE TARIFF

HIGH PRICES AND PROSPERITY

If high prices indicate prosperity—and they probably do for those who get them—the farmers of the United States have been increasingly prosperous since Dec. 1, 1907. The Crop Reporter has collected statistics showing the average prices received by farmers for the principal crops of the country on that date as compared with Jan. 1, 1909. In those 13 months corn advanced from 51 to 60 cents per bushel; wheat, from 87 to 93; oats, from 44 to 48; buckwheat, from 69 to 74; flaxseed, from 95 to \$1.23; potatoes, from 61 to 72; hay, from \$9.09 to \$11.68 per ton; cotton, from 8 to 10 cents per pound. Barley fell from 66 to 56, and rye remained the same.

Agriculture being one of the infant industries of the country, since it is only about 350 years old on this soil, the beneficent tariff throws around it the warm cloak of protection, and shields it from the pauper labor abroad by these duties on the above-mentioned products: Corn, 15 cents; wheat, 25 cents; oats, 15 cents; barley, 30 cents; buckwheat, 15 cents; flaxseed, 25 cents; potatoes, 25 cents per bushel; hay, \$4 per ton, while raw cotton is free.

If the prosperity of a country depends ultimately upon the prosperity of the farming class, as we are so often assured, then in order to make the farmers and all of us more prosperous we ought to raise the tariff on their products, so that they can get still higher prices. Perhaps we can tax ourselves into prosperity just as easily as a man can lift himself over a fence by his bootstraps.—*Boston Globe*.

* * * *

THE STARCH DUTY AVAILED

It is possible for an American to purchase starch in England, which was made in and exported from this country, and ship it back to the United States at less cost than if he had purchased the same commodity in his own country. Forty cents can be saved on every hundred pounds of American starch bought in England and reshipped to the United States. This illuminating disclosure of the workings of Dingleyism was made before the Ways and Means Committee when the starch tariff schedules were under discussion. According to the testimony of the sales manager of the Corn Products Refining Company, one-fourth of the starch manufactured by that concern is shipped to Great Britain and sold at a loss of ten cents a hundred pounds.

There is something incongruous in this. Whatever justification may be found in the old story of "dumping the sur-

plus on the foreigner," we believe, in the case in point, that excuse will not hold. A surplus amounting to twenty-five per cent. is, to say the least, a reflection on the administrative direction of the company. It leads to the inference that the company largely controls the domestic market, in consequence of which it is enabled to charge what it pleases; but, facing a different condition abroad, has to lower its prices. Now, if the "higher wages," etc., in this country will permit this company to sell its goods cheaper abroad than at home, why must protection be given it here?

This revelation is in keeping with others concerning steel, watches and other other commodities for which the people are taxed heavily and unjustly because of an unequal and oppressive tariff system. If direct testimony like this fails to bring about a radical amendment in the Dingley schedules—and we doubt it—nothing short of a revolution will accomplish it. Tariff iniquities are worse than trusts.

—*Wall Street Summary*.

* * *

WHY NOT FREE WOOL?

But there are the shepherds of the land who have cried out so effectually for protection in the past! Must the industry be shackled for a doubtful benefit to those who raise sheep? Raising sheep for wool is not an industry in this country, and can never become so. Land and labor can be used to better advantage. Sheep are raised for meat, and the quantity is determined by the market for the flesh of the live animals. The wool is of course reckoned in the value, but it does not materially affect the number of sheep to be raised, and that number is not sufficient to supply half the wool needed for the manufacturing industry even in its present languishing state, and it is not of a kind or variety to meet the demand except in a partial way. Other kinds have to be imported because they are not grown here, and American wool is mostly used to mix with that of foreign origin, and if that were freely admitted, with the effect of largely increasing the manufacturing industry, it would also increase the demand for domestic wool, and its value to the grower would not suffer materially, while an adequate supply of warm clothing of durable quality and at a moderate price would be brought within the reach of consumers who now dress in little wool and much cotton and shoddy. It would also effectually settle the specific or ad valorem duty problem so far as raw wool is concerned.

—*N. Y. Journal of Commerce*.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE DINGLEY TARIFF

The notion that British manufacturers are arrayed against the Dingley tariff as the great obstacle in their path, is a mistaken one to-day. A prominent English cotton manufacturer is quoted as saying, "I am a standpatter on the American tariff." In an interview following a trip of investigation in this country, he gives his reasons for this position. Of the Dingley tariff he is quoted as saying:

It is one of the best things ever constructed for the British cotton manufacturer, and we shall much regret to see your Congress attempt any reduction. Your protective tariff shuts us out and yourselves in. We lose your market, it is true, but we gain free control of all other markets, because the tariff, which shields you, so increases your cost of production that you have no chance to compete with us in the world's markets, except in case of special fabrics which are a small factor in the world's markets.

He points out that the duty on cotton machinery is a further handicap to our cotton manufacturers, and declares that our machinery makers are not producing appliances equal to the best in Europe. They also cost more, while, on the other hand, there is a tendency to waste and extravagance, fostered partly by a high tariff, which further tells against the American manufacturer. He says:

It costs about \$7 per spindle to equip a first-class mill in the Lancashire district. In the United States a modern plant costs between \$16 to \$20 per spindle, and I have seen mills that cost \$25 per spindle and over. Again, many of your mills are extravagantly and carelessly managed. In Lancashire we could often pay a dividend out of the waste of an American mill. These remarks do not apply to all American mills by any means, for there are a number of establishments admirably equipped and managed. Indeed I have been greatly impressed by American methods at their best, for they show that on equal terms they would give us a hard struggle in the world's markets. But so long as you retain your tariff we shall have no fear. You could not devise a piece of legislation more beneficial to British cotton manufacturers or more injurious to Americans so far as the world's markets are concerned than your tariff.

This is something worth thinking over. If this English manufacturer be

wrong in his conclusions, the standpat-
ters should promptly furnish their
demonstration. —*Eastern Argus.*

DIRECT TAXATION A VALUABLE EDUCATOR

The information from the "leaders of
Congress," by way of the National City
Bank circular, that a return of the in-
ternal revenue war taxes is contem-
plated as a means of meeting the deficit
in the federal budget, is interesting.
Such a policy would not be altogether
regrettable. Stamp taxes would not
be more burdensome to the people than
some of the existing import duties by
means of which exorbitant prices are
maintained on commodities of com-
mon consumption. But if the burden
of the stamp taxes should be felt,
it would serve a good purpose in
attracting attention to the policies of
the government which are responsible
for the deficit. *Direct taxation in this
country would be a valuable educator of
public sentiment.*—*Boston Herald.*

ABOLISH WOOL DUTIES

It is evident, says the *Textile World
Record*, that "one of the most difficult
problems before the committee on ways
and means is the removal of the in-
equalities in the tariff on wool and
woolens." No doubt. It is always a
problem in any protective tariff revision
and always so difficult as to continue a
problem. The only way to dispose of
it is to abolish the duties on raw wool.
Then, and not till then, will end this
incessant grumbling over the inequali-
ties of the wool and woolens taxes, run-
ning down through the ages of the
high-tariff imposition.

—*Springfield Republican.*

GERMAN SHIPOWNERS DECRY SUBSIDIES

While American shipowners are cry-
ing for subsidies their German breth-
ren are crying to be rid of them. The
Hamburg Shipowners' Association, in a
report on the business of the year, says
that subsidizing ships, except for the
regular mail service, is fundamentally
wrong as an economic principle and can
only result in over-production of ship-
tonnage. An ounce of German experi-
ence on this matter is worth a ton of
American ship-subsidy theory.

—*Eastern Argus.*

THE TARIFF AND BUSINESS

The argument that business suffers
whenever the question of tariff revision
is taken up is a very popular one. Ac-
cording to people who take that view,
the time for tariff revision will never
come. If business is booming, we are
told that it would be folly not to let
well enough alone. If business is de-
pressed, we are warned that we are
likely to check a revival, and if busi-
ness is rallying we are told to stand out
of the way and let it rally.

—*Wall Street Journal.*

EVEN BOURBON SENTIMENT CHANGES

Another evidence of the change from
bourbon protectionist ideas going on
among the most enlightened manufac-
turers, was the brief filed the other day,
by Charles P. Searle of Boston in be-
half of machine tool makers and other
users of high speed steel in that city.
It showed how Pittsburg makers are
underselling the Germans on their own
ground and declared that a tariff duty
or at least high duty, is no longer nec-
essary. It is such facts as this that
is undermining standpatism. But the
undermining process will be slow so
long as standpatism retains its grip on
the Republican party.

—*Eastern Argus (Me.).*

CANADIAN LUMBER

Two principles are axiomatic in this
lumber discussion: Every foot of lum-
ber brought into the United States from
Canada saves a foot of American stand-
ing timber. And every year that
passes gives that much more chance for
gain in reforestation. We must have
about 40,000,000,000 feet of lumber. If
we can bring some of that lumber from
Canada, we save to that extent our
own depleted reserves and give time
for our stripped watersheds to grow the
trees that will attract and control the
rainfall. We directly aid two of the
important reforms of the day, reforesta-
tion and conservation of certain natural
resources other than forests.

—*Detroit Free Press.*

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BORDER

The competition of the mills across
the border is so severe that we are un-
able to meet it. They are making our
country the dumping ground for their
surplus stock of rough lumber, which
is selling at prices which we are unable
to meet. As a result, our mills are idle
and many of the mill-owners have be-
come bankrupt. To protect us from
total ruin, we humbly pray that an im-
port duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber
and 30 cents per thousand on shingles
be levied against the cheap product
which is now coming across the border.

No, gentle reader, this is not a pro-
test against cheap Canadian lumber
invading our shores. It is approxi-
mately the language of a memorial
which the Mountain Lumber Manu-
facturers' Association of British Colum-
bia is sending to the Dominion Parlia-
ment in an effort to have a tariff of
the amount mentioned levied against
the cheap American lumber which is
flooding their country. From this it is
quite clear that there are two sides
to some other things besides boundary
lines.

—*Portland Oregonian.*

THE "PRINCIPLE OF PROTEC- TION"

"With few exceptions each member
of the House will fight for the interests
of his own district." Thus, as was ex-
pected, the new tariff bill will go the
way of the old. It is a case of grab,
with fancied local needs preferred to
national interests. Party lines are ob-
literated; the Democrats are as good
protectionists as the Republicans when
there is something to be gained for
their constituents. And in the Senate,
even more than in the House, many of
the proposed reductions will be bit-
terly attacked. Here is Senator Hale
of Maine, for example, declaring that
he will oppose free hides if it is neces-
sary to the restoration of the duties on
wood pulp and print paper. Mr. Cur-
rier of New Hampshire threatens to
get votes from the South, for a suffi-
cient quid pro quo, in order to retain
the present duty on lumber. Neither
cares a rap, apparently, for the fate of
the forests or sees that both States will
pay dearly hereafter for their destruc-
tion. Thus all down the list, the
bargaining begins. What a commen-
tary it is upon the "principle" of pro-
tection.—*Providence Journal.*

TARIFF COMMISSION DELUSIONS

The process of education and enlight-
enment on the tariff is not a thing for
the government to undertake through a
paid commission, any more than the
process of educating the farmers how
to do their work and how to live in
their rural communities. Organiza-
tions for promoting tariff revision or
tariff reform may do much at their
own expense to collect facts and spread
information which will have effect
upon the public mind and directly upon
legislation and the administration of
the law, and all agitation and discus-
sion will help the cause along. If the
schools inculcate sound principles of
economy and leaders of thought and ac-
tion become imbued with them, and if
the people will send as their representa-
tives to legislative bodies men qualified
for their duties, all these problems will
be solved, but it is only along such lines
of progress that much will be accom-
plished. A commission to concentrate
attention and effort upon the reform of
our tariff policy and to shape measures
for giving it effect might serve a use-
ful purpose in overcoming opposition,
but the "permanent, non-partisan,
semi-judicial tariff commission" which
has been thus far advocated, is really
intended to give more complete effect
to the existing policy.

Speaking of leaving the revision of
the tariff in the hands of its friends,
why not leave the revision of the crim-
inal code in the hands of the inmates
of the state penitentiary?

—*The Chancellor, Omaha, Neb.*

A TOPSY-TURVY REASONING

Professor John Bascom of Williams College

A very common plea for protection in the United States is that our laborers should not be left in competition with the pauper labor of Europe. This argument has a show of reason, and, if it were truly a statement of facts, might seem conclusive. The case is rather that pauper labor, the world over is the most unproductive and least profitable of all labor. If skilled labor needs protection against pauper labor, why should we seek this form of progress? Skilled labor gains its higher wages by virtue of its greater efficiency. Its only secret is its superior productive power. It is this which carries it forward. We allow ourselves in this discussion to be misled by nominal prices when we suppose the wages given to pauper labor to be lower than the larger price of skilled labor. Not only do wages advance by virtue of the superior worth of skill, they sink in amount because of the inferior productive power of the poor workman. Pauper labor is ever falling from a low to a still lower value. * * * If the producer were compelled to choose finally between skilled and unskilled workmen, he would hesitate long before he accepted the latter. It is an unkindly preference of pauper labor as a means of affecting the labor market that makes its competition so fatal to the good workmen. The real protection needed against pauper labor does not lie between foreign and domestic labor, but between the thrifty and the unthrifty laborer in our own land. The country in which labor is best rewarded and the most skilful is the country from whose competition we have most to fear.

It is not the wages of workmen that determine the possibilities of trade. It has long since been shown that two countries, producing the same commodities, can trade with each other, if there is a difference between the two in the skill which they bring to the several commodities. If their productive power is essentially the same in the entire circle of production, there is no call for exchange; but if superior skill, shown in the direction of one form of labor, is present, it immediately gives a motive for trade. It is some special power that creates a market. The argument drawn from pauper labor derives its force solely from the opportunity it gives of attacking, in the home market, the wages of the skilful.

A second argument for protection is derived from the undeniable gains which go with a variety of industries. Every community, large or small, is likely to owe something of its strength to various forms of production which minister to each other. It would seem, therefore, to be a wise act on the part of a community to aid those industries, kept back by some transient difficulty. The danger of the policy is double. We may be led to introduce

a form of labor which cannot, from the nature of the case, permanently prosper; or we may continue to help an industry which is already on a par with its fellows. The aided occupation does not willingly resign the help it is receiving. The natural diffusion of advantage among producers, once broken, is not readily restored. A confusion of thoughts and claims arises which long embarrasses action. An "infant industry" becomes a giant industry, as in the case of the steel trust, and still feels that its claim on the community remains good. Yet this feeling is in subversion of the feeling which in the beginning gave rise to protection. The variety and equality of industries were then the ruling idea; now we are overborne by the powers of a single form of business, identifying itself in so many ways with the prosperity of the nation. Thus the argument which first moved forward on the foundation of widened industry, now moves backward to power concentrated in trusts. * * * There is no form of industry more completely undemocratic, more subversive of the equality of opportunity which lies at the basis of our social system, than a steel trust, yet we have reached it by a method announced as a search for the common welfare. * * *

Products Protected, Labor Unprotected

A protective policy, as we develop it, tends to remove products from competition, while leaving its full weight to rest on services. Take any trust aided by this method, and it is shortly found in neglect of both these principles of production. It strives to cut off competition in products and to promote it between workmen. In the space opened up between these two it builds up its own prosperity. Pittsburg, the headquarters of the steel trust, is forced up to a most difficult and dangerous form of production, and yet shows but a small and inadequate participation of workmen in the resulting prosperity. Advantage is taken of the ignorance of workmen, and their diverse nationalities, to keep them in severe dependence on the ruling powers. * * *

It matters little how much workmen, by what is termed an open shop, fall into the hands of employers. Their prosperity still seems to be identified with the prosperity of the production with which they are occupied. Their workmen are led to sustain a policy of which they are the constant victims. Their ultimate liberties and enjoyments are sacrificed to the exigencies of the hour.

Pittsburg, as a city, shows the fruits of protection on workmen in its later and normal stages. Protection, in the outset, is based on equality of advantages between extended forms of industry, and ends in the exorbitant and

tyrannous claims of a single branch. By a slow accumulation of advantages the equal and natural distribution of gains which belongs to democratic society is broken up, and the many become subject to a tyranny they have helped to establish. So utterly are the processes of reasoning turned end for end, and made to issue in results the opposite of those ostensibly proposed by them.

"A FAMOUS VICTORY"

If the new tariff as drafted should become a law it will go down in history like little Peterkin's famous victory:

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.

"Why, that I cannot tell," said he;
"But 'twas a famous victory."

A tax of from eight to nine cents a pound on tea will make the housewife the mortal enemy of the Government. Sugar remains about the same; cocoa fares like tea; starch gets a reduction; bacon and ham and fresh beef a reduction, but what we use of them doesn't come through the custom house. Lemons, pineapples and spices share a tax with tea; timber is cut in half; so with lumber and steel. Boots and shoes go down, but we make our own boots and shoes and many for other nations. Hides are free, and this will help the Argentines, though our Western cattle raisers suffer so much from that item that the price of beef must mount to make up for the difference. Per-^{sum-}ery, soaps and toilet articles go up; ^{but} everybody who wants it can re-^{oice} over a cut of one-half in gunpowder.

We are quite sure that nobody in this country will be benefited by such schedules, least of all the Government's revenues. We don't think any of our statesmen will later be claiming credit for this little Peterkin "famous victory." Nevertheless, if the measure were much worse than it is—and it possibly might be worse—we should still say, hurry through with it! Get it out of the way so that American capital and labor can go to work. While the tariff bill hangs fire they can do little or nothing.—N. Y. Press.

THE DREAMER

Where'er oppressive forces rise
To crush the spirit free,
A dreamer dwells. In dungeon cells
Is born sweet liberty.
What chains of circumstance may bind
The pleasant paths of peace
Are broken by the dreamer's song,
To find his heart's release.

No desert waste of mocking sand,
No far, uncharted sea,
But gives unto a dreamer's faith
Some paradise to be.
And all the wicked wars of hate,
Where men for truth have died,
Have won for love some lessed boon
By dreamless hearts un-^{sd.}
—George E. Bowen, *The Public, Chicago.*

LITTLE RED RIDINGHOOD



From the *Boston Herald*
by permission

“COME RIGHT IN, DEAR”