



Correspondence.

REVIEW OF SENATOR SLATER.

Letter in Answer to the Resolutions of the Columbia River Wool Growers Association

Editor Willamette Farmer:

The letter of Senator Slater to the "demand" made upon him for service as their representative by the wool growers of Eastern Oregon, is unique in some respects; so much so that it will bear examination in all its points, as the letter is a long one, and the subject one that the Senator (it is presumed from the nearly three months time it took him to write it) was not familiar with.

First—The general tone is unusually bold. The Senator is evidently not afraid of his wool growing constituents.

Second—He takes them to task for their use of the word "demand" in asking his aid to defend what he evidently believes is so much a "special interest," or to entitle him to call them "monopolists." This, so far as words go, is "returning a Roland for an Oliver."

Third—He tells them that the National Government must raise revenue, and one means of doing so is by duties on imports, amongst which duties on foreign wool and woolen goods has "always, excepting from 1846 to 1864, been of a very highly protective character."

Fourth—He then tells them that the government was from all sources receiving more revenue than was required average duties on manufactured woolens were by the tariff of 1867, 63.40 per cent. On No. 1 clothing wool, 43.74 per cent.; on combing wool, 42.44 per cent.; on carpet wool, 27.38 per cent.; which is an average of 37.85 per cent.; little more than half the rates on woolen goods.

Fifth—He proceeds to show that by the recent change in the above rates the sum of \$9,000,000 is deducted from the price to the wool growers on the crop of 300,000,000 pounds of 1883, or, as the Senator puts it to restore the rates would make the wool wearing people of the United States pay that sum in the aggregate. \$295,000 of \$9,000,000 would go as revenue to the United States government, and the balance to the producers of wool throughout the nation.

The revenue the government does not need, the Senator says. And he seems to think, that as "Uncle Sam furnishes the wool growers of Eastern Oregon" with free pasture, it is unreasonable for them "to want him to tax the rest of his children for their benefit." Here it seems to me Senator Slater lets himself down. Except that some might see: I'll teach you to "demand" between the lines." The letter is not unbecoming a man of his known bias on the subject. But I ask, does the United States government "furnish the wool growers, cattle or horse raisers free pasture?" Can they under existing laws, without perjury, get more than 320 acres by giving value received in labor and time or money for it? It is not more true that the settlers of Eastern Oregon, or their fathers, have given the land to the government and it has withdrawn it largely from the market in favor of road companies? Is it not true that the difficulty of securing a legal right to the amount of pasture sufficient for a secure business is one of the chief obstacles to permanent settlement in Eastern Oregon? The sum of the Senator's argument so far is: The change in the tariff of 1867 deducted from the crop of Eastern Oregon wool three cents per pound; that as a special tax in favor of the wool grower it was unjust to the forty-nine of his fellow citizens who do not grow wool but who wear woolens which would thereby be made higher priced; therefore, as the interests of the forty-nine in getting cheap cloth is forty-nine times greater than the one wool grower the tax should not be restored.

Sixth—The next position taken by the Senator is: "It has been demonstrated

over and over again from the statistics on wool prices in this country covering a period of many years, during which time wool has been subjected to varying duties, sometimes practically prohibiting, at other times letting in the lower grades entirely free with moderate duties upon the higher and finer grades, that the domestic product has always borne better prices under a low tariff or when wool was free, than during periods of high duties. This fact has been reiterated in this country and elsewhere many times by publishers of the highest character." The logic of this, would be that reduction of the tariff would raise the price of wool in favor of Eastern Oregon wool-growers and consequently raise the cost of woolen goods to his forty-nine fellow citizens who wore the goods. Have we seen such results? Can a U. S. Senator think we expect to see such results? A fuller statement of the facts in connection with the tariff legislation will prove that previous to 1846 the frequent changes were almost as destructive to American interests connected with wool as a settled policy in free trade could well have been. British policy gave almost free pasturage to wool-growers in Australia and other colonies and dependencies. British manufacturing interests kept agents in New York and Washington cities. British money was used in times of depression created by party contests and partisan changes of the tariff to slaughter American sheep. From such causes the depression upon wool growing was such that the sheep of the United States during the decade from 1840 to 1850 the increase was but twelve per cent. while the population increased about thirty-three per cent. In 1843, while a few American citizens in Oregon were, without help from the United States, establishing law and dominion for it, which settled the question of ownership from the Pacific ocean to the Rocky Mountains, and by the same agency beginning a war against British trade interests which at the commencement of the decade had complete control of those interests in what is now known as the "inland empire." In 1846 American citizenship was victorious as to the Pacific side. In the same year British trade interests were equally victorious on the Atlantic side. The control acquired was based on the proposition: That the holder of property who has for sale what another party must have, can set the price. The destruction of American sheep was part of the means to give Great Britain this position.

The effect of this distinction in favor of the foreign wool dealers and wool manufacturers can be seen in the fact that it immediately and rapidly increased the imports of wool into the United States. The operations of destruction were most active in 1843 and 1844. In 1843 the imports of foreign wool for nine months was but 3,517,950 pounds valued at \$245,000. In 1845 it was 23,833,040 pounds, valued at \$1,689,794. In 1850-1 it was 32,548,693 pounds valued at \$3,800,000. At this time and for ten years following, cotton was king and his legislators seems from the figures above given to have ruled under the policy of giving Johnny Bull control of the American market in order to keep his good will as a purchaser of the cotton crop. The effect of this policy in the national wool and woolen industries may be seen in the fact that from 1850 to 1860 consumers of wool in the United States increased 8,225,464, being at the rate of 351 per cent. in the ten years. During the same period, the sheep of the country increased but 1,594,536, and during the same time there was imported into the United States over \$330,000,000 worth of wool and woolen goods. The value of the manufactured wool imported during the period was \$295,834,584. The character of these goods were chiefly of the finest kinds of goods but much of it was low class shoddy goods that laborers in cities and sailors and miners were in the habit of buying because it was low priced. In 1860 the production of wool in the United States amounted to 60,511,343 pounds; the increase during the decade from 1850 to 1860 being but 15 per cent. against 351 per cent. increase of population. The population was over 31,000,000 so that there was not two pounds of wool per capita. Nine pounds of clothing material per capita is the estimated re-

quirements of the people, so that allowing half to be cotton the domestic product then did not furnish more than half the needed supply. Consequently the American people were tending steadily towards the destiny predicted for them by Sir Robert Peel, the most potent man in Great Britain at the commencement of this period; and who said "it has the destiny of England to clothe America, i. e., the United States, and the destiny of America to feed England." The civil war was begun during a portion of which time the Nation's defenders were many of them clothed with stuff (shoddy purchased by the United States government in England) which literally melted from men's backs under the influence of warm summer rains. The United States had to send to Europe for bunting, out of which to make Union flags, and for worsted braids to enable the soldiers to distinguish their officers. The first attempt to manufacture such things in the United States started on yarns imported from England. It gave stimulus to home production however, and at its close a great amount of woolen goods purchased for the army was thrown on the market causing a temporary glut and depression, which no doubt had a great influence in securing the tariff of 1867. It was a needed measure of national importance, and has had the effect of helping to bring the United States government out of its financial difficulties, giving profitable employment to a great number of citizens, both in the factory and in the field, spreading settlement over the vast area of grazing land between the Mississippi and the Pacific ocean, and raised our wool product from 60,000,000 pounds for a population of 31,000,000 to 300,000,000 for a population of 50,000,000, thus giving about six pounds capita of our population, and bringing near at hand the complete supply of domestic manufactures by domestic grown wools, except in regard to the extra fine combing wools, which, so far American growers have neglected in favor of the extra heavy fleeced American merino wool, which is best for most purposes. The desire for the fine, long staple Australian, represented by George William Bond, mentioned by Mr. Slater in his letter. The desire to get a supply of that kind lower by the amount of the duty taken off, which led to this discussion, caused a certain class of New England protectionists to join those who favored a tariff for revenue only and compelled our Representative, Hon. M. C. George, to vote for the change for fear of worse consequences. The same set of facts, or similar ones, quoted from M. Baudrillard and Mr. Bond were used by the National Wool Manufacturers as the inducing cause of appealing to American wool growers through its Bulletin ably edited by John L. Hayes, and inviting the cooperation of the National Wool Growers Association in securing the tariff of 1867. That the almost double rate of protection of the American manufacturer was left untouched, and part of the smaller share is taken to give to the partner in interest who already had "the lion's" share was hardly just; yet I believe the loser cares more about the disturbance than the charge made against him, because it gives reason to fear his interests may for a long time to come, be made the foot ball of party. But the game is opened, and it needs no prophet to say that before it is ended somebody will get hurt. Those who intend taking a part in the game must look at a different state of things from the national condition in 1849-50 or 1860. Wool growing is no longer bounded on the West by the Mississippi. The business is stronger West than East of that stream and followed by a more independent class of men as to party lines. Interest in manufactures are not now bounded by the Mason and Dixon line. It will not be many years until it can be said of the new South as of the good wife in the Bible: "She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands." The Empress of the northwest will be her elder sister by 25 years or so.

Who has Poultry for Sale? YAKIMA CITY, W. T., JAN. 13, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer: I have watched the columns of the FARMER very closely for some time past, for an advertisement of some poultry-raiser. I would like to purchase a few blooded chickens, such as, Plymouth Rock, Buff Cochen, or White Brahma. If you can inform me through the columns of your paper where I can obtain either eggs or chickens for the coming spring, I will be greatly obliged. We have had a very pleasant winter

so far, have not had an inch of snow. The weather is now more like April than January, the ground is in good condition to plow. Stock on the range look well and grass is good. Prospects for the future never were better. We are all very much pleased with the FARMER and look anxiously for its coming. Yours, etc., T. H. L.

The Quillente Country.

PLEASANT HILL, Or., JAN. 17, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

There being quite a number of citizens in this locality who are interested in the Quillente country, lying on the coast in the northwestern part of Washington Territory, would kindly ask you to furnish the following information if you are prepared to do so in your valuable paper.

First—Do vessels of any kind enter that port?

Second—If so do they make regular trips?

Third—At what time?

Fourth—Is there a safe port of entry for small or large vessels?

Fifth—What is the character of the climate?

Sixth—The nature of the soil, and in short all that is necessary to make pleasant homes?

Any or all of the above information would be thankfully received.

CITIZEN.

Don't Like Lincoln Grass.

THE DALLES, Or., JAN. 16, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

I have seen inquiries in your paper about Lincoln grass seed. I think farmers should be cautious about raising or sowing it for, as I have found out by a neighbor's raising some of it this year, that it is the same thing that we call meadow oats in Wasco. The seed was sent here to my uncle, ten years ago, from Iowa. I got seed from him and sowed eight acres, I raised two crops and I have been trying to get rid of it ever since. Wasco straw is far superior to it; for hay, it is not sweet and very light for pasture; horses will not eat it; cattle and sheep will eat it when green. It grows fast, its height being from four to seven feet; seeds quick and drops off and starts up in fence corners and everywhere if it is not cultivated every year. It grows in bunches. I consider it a great nuisance. Yours, A. D. BOLTON.

Want a Change.

SHUMWAY, Ill., JAN. 14, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

I saw a piece in the FARMER a short time ago from Illinois. The FARMER is a very valuable paper and has more than one reader in this State.

I am a young man twenty-two years old, and was born and raised on a farm and expect to live and die as a farmer, but what I want is a change of climate. I want to go where the mercury does not ever go as low as 30 deg. below zero, as such was the case here on the morning of Jan. 5th, and I want to go where more than from three to ten bushels of wheat can be raised to the acre, as such was the case with us last year. I have been reading considerably of late about that great State, Oregon, but there is a number of things that I have not learned yet. One thing is, suppose a young man would buy a piece of open land, would he have to fence it before he could raise crops from it? Another thing, on these lands that we read of, that produce such abundant crops, are they cursed with these boulder rocks as is the case of a great many farms in Missouri and to some extent in the northern counties of this State. If the above will be answered satisfactory perhaps it will bring myself and others to that much read of "garden spot of the world"—Oregon. WM. H. DEICHMAN.

[NOTE.—The person taking up a farm; especially in Eastern Oregon, will be obliged to fence his lands, as a matter of course. The same is true of lands in Western Oregon, except in the seablands and places that no one would take up, especially along the Columbia river or Snake river. Western Oregon has rocks, but we rarely ever see any that cause trouble.—EDITOR.]

Sheep Killing Dog Law.

BEAVER GLEN FARM, JAN. 11, '84. Editor Willamette Farmer:

While East last fall I observed that in those States where they tax dogs to pay for the sheep killed by dogs—the overplus to go into the school fund—particularly in Indiana and Ohio, that they are fast taking the lead as wool producing States. Their worn out wheat lands are being enriched by sheepling them. The Ohio dog tax law is rather severe; I like the Indiana dog law better; the law there hung fire until some years ago and Gen. Joel Meredith, a prominent democratic politician and stock raiser championed the bill that finally became a law. The last legislature, democratic, made some sensible amendments to the law, namely, making it one hundred dollars fine to kill a dog upon which the tax is paid and doing away with the tags formerly worn by the dogs taxed. The law is popular in Indiana and she is increasing her flocks. I sent to Indiana to get a copy of this law, and at the last Legislature I gave the copy to Hon. T. W. Davenport and found most of the members inclined to pass such a law, particularly the country members, and Mr. Perkins, of Douglas county, had a bill to that effect. The bill was defective and I tried to get Perkins and Davenport together to frame a suitable bill, but it failed somehow. Now is it possible we shall have to do the naughty thing of electing a democratic Legislature in Oregon in order to get this law passed? I hope not, but we must have the law at all events, for it is of more importance than the mortgage tax law by all odds. Under the Indiana dog law, with a good bounty on wolf scalps, most all farmers would keep all the sheep they could and our well worn wheat fields would soon recover their lost fertility. In Kentucky I saw the finest of sheep ranges and hardly any sheep. One gentleman had a range for two hundred head of sheep, I told him of his chance; said he, I had sheep, but the dogs killed so many I had to quit, and sold them to the butcher. G. W. HUNT.

Time to Salt Pork.

FOOLA, Or., JAN. 18, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

It has been my practice for twenty-five years to cut up and salt my hogs as fast as they were killed. I never have but one hog on the pole at a time, and two gambrels have served me many years. My way was so unusual that it took from ten to fifteen years for old farmers to believe in it; young farmers learn in one year. Pork salted as fast as killed readily takes salt, draws out all blood and heat in a few hours, and if the weather is cold will take enough salt while cooling to save it, and if well salted it hardly ever freezes. I re-salt and pack in three or four days, keep in salt 21 days, wash the joints in boiling water, pepper with ground black pepper, and hang up to smoke. The fly does not care to meddle with peppered meat—having never lost a joint. I have known many persons to let hogs hang out all night and freeze too hard to cut up, and as a consequence much spoiled meat is the result of such old fogy notions. Cut up and salt while warm (do not bulk it) and no fear of spoiling meat, on re-salting, bulk up well, and do not be too saving of salt, it is cheaper than meat. It is the almost universal practice as far as my practice of salting meat is known, to salt while warm. F. L.

A Wool Grading House.

Portland, Or., JAN. 18, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

A wool grading house is to be established in Portland, but we don't exactly see how Portland is to be the center of the wool trade when nine-tenths of the wool is grown east of the Cascades and will be shipped East. To ship to Portland and have it graded and shipped back again will be poor policy. To establish a wool grading house at Castle Rock and ship from there East would seem more like economy in the matter. Wool grading should be done and the wool shipped East well scoured, no doubt about that being the right policy. THE PARTY who advertises Mammoth wheat in this issue has sent us a sample. Any one who may be skeptical in the matter can call and examine the sample at our office.

DIED.

EAST PORTLAND, JAN. 18, 1884. Editor Willamette Farmer:

The youngest son of Mr. John Dolan died of scarlet fever. Little Lester was three years and nine months old, yet endured his suffering with extreme patience, and when his spirit had left its lifeless form he lay with that sweet and peaceful smile he always wore, which must have evinced his sorrowing parents that their loss was his eternal gain. He was indeed a lovely boy, with black sparkling eyes and curly hair, and such a short time since he was in health and the pride at home it seems but a vision and not real.

No dream, 'tis real, his soul has fled, And judgment now is part. Retained he shines among the blest Crowned through his cross at last. Mourn no more, nor wail his back, O sorrowful parents of earth, More tender love his love for you Than ever since his birth.

"Weep not dear friends, for your darling boy Who was loved so well by all; His young life, so spotless, no foe from alloy He's but answered a fond Father's call."

"While I whisper a few words of comfort, dear friends, Come dry your fond eyes, for my heart Feels for you; Yes, tear for tear with those who I read, In this sad ordeal you are called to pass through."

Earth is not near so far away From the home of the angels where I lived once a day, About and above they are hovering near And trying their best our lone hearts to cheer.

"In tears you have parted with him who is gone, And felt as though life could have no bright morrow; But with joy and with smiles you fondly will greet When life's work is o'er and in death you shall sleep."

With loving sympathy, your friend, Mrs. E. J. PUCK.

At Rush Island, Linn county, December 26th, 1883, Reemie McBea, aged one year, ten months, and twenty days.

Did she find a home in Heaven? Did she find the gates ajar? Did the angels meet and take her In the shining golden car? A FRIEND.

An Agricultural Revolution.

Ten or fifteen years ago Wisconsin was considered one of the largest wheat States. But the dairy interests took lodgement there. Grass soon succeeded the smaller grains, and now, in Southern Wisconsin especially, butter and cheese and live stock form the principle products of the thrifty and enterprising farmers of that superior agricultural region. Southern Minnesota has become incultivated with the dairy and creamery fever, which prompts the Minneapolis Tribune to make these remarks: "An important change is taking place in the character of the agricultural industry of the southern half of this State. Instead of relying mainly on wheat, the farmers there are putting more capital into dairying and growing horses, cattle and hogs. This will lead to the cultivation of corn and oats much more extensively, and the result already obtained prove that the policy will greatly increase the profitability of farming in that locality, and prevent the frequent embarrassment flowing from dependence upon a single crop. The creamery business especially is developing with remarkable rapidity. There are already sixty-eight of these in operation, and eight more will begin business early in the spring. The butter produced is of excellent quality, and commands high prices."

The following is a statement of business transacted at the United States land office in Washington Territory, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883: Colfax, total, all entries 252,957 02 acres; cash received, \$87,242 46; Yakima, total, all entries 56,233 06 acres; \$14,681 84 cash received; Walla Walla, total, all entries 201,926 90 acres; \$112,771 15 cash received; Vancouver, total, all entries 73,019 14 acres; \$59,592 80 cash received; Olympia, total, all entries 313,278 65 acres; \$378,724 16 cash received.

By the above it will be seen that the Olympia land office has done as much business as all the other offices in the territory combined. While not as much land has been disposed of there as in all of those offices, yet the cash received amounted to over \$100,000 more than all combined. Since the last of June the business has been very large, and will no doubt swell the receipts this year to a round million of dollars in the territory.