SUPPLEMENT.

Containing Extracts from

THE DAILY OREGONIAN

The Fallacies of PROTECTION!

From the Standpoint of the Daily Oregonian

Wool and Lumber Ought to be Free!

A Tax on Sugar is for Revenue and Not Protection.

A Characteristic Ruse—Free Whiskey and Tobacco.

The Principle of the Mills Bill Sustained by High Republican Authority.

On no other subject [protection] is there so much effort made to mistify and befog the people. Perhaps the reason is it pays to do so. It must be owned, too, that the beneficiaries of the system are highly successful in their duperies of the people at large.--Oregonian, Feb. 2, 1882.

INTRODUCTORY.

The articles contained in this paper, and credited to the *Oregonian*, are editorial articles taken from the files of the *Oregonian*, covering the period from 1880 to 1887, inclusive. They comprise only a part of much that that paper has had to say during the time mentioned upon the subject of protection and tariff reform, and in exposure of the impolicy and injustice of the present system. They demonstrate the soundness of the views contained in President Cleveland's tariff message, and are in perfect accord with all the essential features of the Mills bill. They show conclusively that wool and lumber should be free; that the tariff on sugar is "a tax for revenue, and is directly opposed in principle and effect to a duty imposed for protection," and contain, therefore, a complete answer to the charge that the Mills bill, which takes nearly $12,000,000 off of sugar, is partial and sectional in favor of the Southern planters. These articles expose in advance the fallacy of revenue reduction, proposed by the Republican platform, by abolishing the internal revenue tax, thus making whiskey and tobacco free, while the necessaries of life are made dear. In short, these articles are unanswerable arguments in support of the policy of the Democratic platform and candidates upon the tariff question.

Aside from their intrinsic value, as a contribution to Democratic campaign literature, these articles have a special value as an expression of the opinions of one of the ablest and best known Republicans on the Pacific Coast, upon the vital questions of the canvas, made from time to time during a series of years when these questions were not in issue between parties and when their consideration was not biased by the prejudice of party politics.

"Long ere now, had not the Democratic Party with its characteristic pigheadness, persisted in its attacks on the settlements of the war, there would have been a reckoning on the subject of tariff plunder, the navigation laws, dishonest money and the entire scheme of quackeries sustained by greed, ignorance and demagogery in combination--and now, if the Democratic party is done with its follies, the reckoning will not be very much longer delayed."

One of the Lame Arguments of Protection.

[Daily Oregonian, January 11, 1881.]

Mr. Thos. S. Lang, of the Dalles, is an occasional contributor to several journals of the State in defense of the policy of "protection." His latest essay is an attempt to disprove what the *Oregonian* recently said concerning high prices as an effect of the protective system. It is argued that protection does not make high prices, but gives us low prices; that in consequence of this policy we are enabled to get manufactured goods cheaper than we should obtain them under free trade and that we make goods so cheap under protection that we are ablo to undersell England even in her own market. And Mr. George B. Loring, of Massachusets is produced as authority for the statement—which he is said to sustain by giving trade prices at Manchester and Birmingham—that consumers in the United States are enabled to buy, under our protective system, "almost everything" in the many lines of manufactured goods of home production, at lower rates than they would have to pay for the English product. Here it is that excess of zeal for the protectected monopolists of the United States, of whom of course Mr. Loring is one, leads that gentleman to prove too much. For of course if we manufacture and sell "almost everything" at lower prices than Great Britain can, we want no "protection." We are not in danger, then, from the "pauper labor" of Europe. Our home manufactures would not be "destroyed" by those whom we even now undersell. And thus the main argument for "protection" is overthrown by the too zealous advocates of that system.

As a matter of fact, however, the statement is not well founded. It is part of the scheme of sophistry, cozenage and deception by which the monopoly system sustains itself. Of course our manufacturers are not offering cheaper goods than Great Britain. If they were, the natural law of prices would keep out British goods, and there would be no clamor from our protecting monopolists for a tariff to prohibit foreign importations. These protected monopolists know well the purpose of a protective tariff. Such tariff is a schedule of taxes levied on imported goods with design to raise the price of home commodities. It forbids the consumer to buy cheap foreign goods that may be offered to him, and forces him to buy the home product at advanced prices. This is the whole scheme of a protective tariff. Except for this, no manufacturer would demand protection. Men like Mr. Loring of Massachusetts want the duties so high as to exclude foreign goods altogether, and thus give them the complete monopoly of the home market, which is the perfection of protection, or at least so high as to raise the price of foreign goods a little above the point at which they are desirous of selling their own. Our tariff legislation is wholly controlled in support of this system. The manufacturing interest has become powerful enough to control legislation absolutely for its own profit and against the interest of consumers. Government is made an instrument through which one class of citizens is given legal authority to plunder another. This is "protection." Of course those who are so favored by the power of the Government will not willingly give up their advantage. They even deign to argue to the victims of the policy—and all communities situated like ours are victims of it—that it is immensely to their advantage that the policy be continued and sustained.

Long ere now, had not the Democratic party with its characteristic pig-headedness, persisted in its attacks on the settlements of the war, there would have been a reckoning on the subject of tariff plunder, the navigation laws, dishonest money and the entire scheme of quackeries sustained by greed, ignorance and demogogery in combination—and now, if the Democratic party has made its final effort to rehabilitate Bourbonism and is done with its follies, the reckoning will not be very much longer delayed. Divison of parties on these issues, which will take place when the Democratic party gets done mourning for the hopeless past and trying to restore it, will cut right through the lines of parties as now constituted. What is demanded is honest money, free ships, revision of the tariff in the interest of the people rather than in that of monopolies, and the general policy of favoring trade or allowing it freedom rather than obstructing it. Proper adjustment would have been forced on these questions long ago had not the Democratic party persisted so strenuously in upholding the exploded theories of the state sovereignty rebellion, thus compelling all who believed in the nationality of the United States to combine for the defense of it and for preservation of the results of the great war.

Protection "is a good policy to pile up the profits of the protected monopolist, but a bad one for us out of whom these profits are drawn."

Too Transparent.

[Daily Oregonian, Dec. 29th, 1880.]

There is an ignorance of the fundamental principles of political economy which supposes coin to be the only actual wealth; and therefore it is imagined that if a people maintain a policy which prohibits the importation of foreign goods, that such goods can be had cheap, and collect their foreign balances, when there happens to be any, in coin—though they are obliged to pay out the money at once to protected home monopolists for the very goods at higher prices, which they could obtain at low prices under free trade--such policy must be the highest fruit of wise statesmanship. This, in brief, is the political economy of the Salem *Statesman*. It imagines it exactly the thing for a people situated as we are here to have the tariff maintained at prohibitory rates, so that we can buy none of the cheap goods which Great Britain has to sell, and take the little money we get for our wheat, which must be sold at a low price (because, as we will not trade with our customer, we cannot get ships enough to carry it away) and buy of our "protected" eastern manufacturers the goods which we must have at the high prices which the tariff enables them to exact. This is a good policy to pile up the profits of the protected monopolist, but a bad one for us out of whom these profits are drawn. It compels us to part with our products at a low price and buy what we must have at high prices. And this is just what is the matter with Oregon at this moment. Every item which enters into the production of wheat is taxed for the benefit of eastern monopolists, even to the farmer's harness leather, harrow teeth, the very bags he puts his wheat in, and the iron rails on which it is carried to tide water; and then because the ships of our customers are allowed to bring nothing to the country, but must come in ballast, and therefore earn enough in wheat charters to pay for the entire trip around the world, our farmers can get but little for their wheat, and that little they are obliged to part with in buying "protected" goods at "protected" prices. This may suit the Salem *Statesman*, but it does not please those who have the comprehension to see through the sophistries of the so-called protective system—a system expressly devised and maintained to enhance the price of American manufactured goods, and to force non-manufacturing communities, like ourselves, to buy them, who otherwise would buy cheap goods from anybody offering them. The political power which maintains this unjust and oppressive system is in our great eastern states, and the victimized have not strength to abolish it. But at least this power should not cozen and hoodwink the victim into the belief that the wholesale robbery which it legalizes and maintains for its own profit, is just the the thing we ought to be satisfied with. It is too transparent.

[Daily Oregonian, Dec. 11, 1880.]

An inquiry is addressed to the Oregonian by a person who read its remarks of yesterday on "Loss of the Carrying Trade." The inquiry is as follows, viz:

"Since we produce all materials that enter into ship-building, viz: timber, iron, etc., I am at a loss to determine what you refer to by remarking: 'But such are the duties levied on materials that go into ship-building,' etc. Will you please explain in what manner said duties are levied on home-produced materials?"

This inquirer is misled by his own confusion of terms. Though duties are not levied on home-produced materials that enter into ship-building, yet the cost of such materials is enormously increased by our system of protection. We refuse to let in the foreign article, but invite the producer of the home article to make the price excessive, and "protect" him in doing so. Just as our tariff on steel rails increases the cost of all steel rails used in this country, whether imported or produced here, so our tariff on ship-building materials increases the cost of all materials of this class. Herein is one of the causes why ship-builders of the United States cannot compete with those of other countries. That we have in our country all necessary ship-building materials is a bootless boast, so long as our tariff policy makes them so costly that we cannot use them.

A duty ought to be laid on those articles which will produce a clear revenue at least for collection. ★ ★ ★ Sugar is one of these. ★ ★ ★ It is a tax for revenue, and is directly opposed in principle and effect to a duty imposed for protection.--Oregonian, Feb. 24, 1881.

The reduction of the revenue on sugar proposed by the bill is $11,759,799, and excepting the woolen schedule, is nearly twice as much as all others combined. ★ ★ ★ But on correct principles of taxation there ought to be a higher duty on sugar than on any other article on the dutable list.--Speech of Roger Q. Mills, July 21, 1888.

Sugar, Revenue and Protection.

[Daily Oregonian, February 24, 1881.]

Again the principle known as free trade does not contemplate the total removal of duties. Such a result would not be contemplated, even if it were for any reason desirable. Revenue must be had and no method for raising revenue has ever been devised which has, on the whole, been so satisfactory as levying duties on imports. The whole question at issue turns on the principle upon which these duties are to be imposed. A duty ought to be laid upon those articles which will produce a clear revenue at least for collections. Sugar is one of these. Coffee and tea are also admirably adapted to the same end, though our laws blunderingly exempt them from duty. When such articles are taxed the whole of the tax goes into the public treasury. It is a tax for revenue, and is directly opposed in principle and effect to a duty imposed for "protection." The object of those laws is not revenue, but prohibition of importations, in order to give the home market to the protected class at high prices. The members of the Iron and Steel Association profiting immensely under this system, understand its effects well enough, how much soever their organ may attempt to disguise them.

Fortunes for the Few.

[Daily Oregonian, February 2, 1882.]

* * * * * * *

A limited class have conceived and put in practice the doctrine that it is a good scheme for them to make the great body of the people pay high prices for commodities which the comparatively small class have to sell, and the government is called in to rob the many for the benefit of the few. This is "protection" and all there is of it. On no other subject is there so much effort to mistify and befog people. Perhaps the reason is that it pays to do so. It must be owned, too, that the beneficiaries of the system are highly successful in the practice of their duperies on the people at large.

Thus our labor suffers from a system of robbery, disguised under forms of quackery for pretended protection of American labor. The stupidity that doesn't see it, particularly on this coast, where the producing classes are so plainly the victims of it, is phenominal and perhaps hopeless.---*Daily Oregonian, Oct. 21, 1881.*

Government must have revenue and sugar is one of the articles that must bear a duty, so long as revenue is required. The tariff on sugar is a tariff for revenue and not protection. Our country produces but an insignificant part of the sugar consumed in it. The object of the sugar duty is to bring money into the treasury. It fulfills that object. But the object of the duty on many other articles, as wool, iron and steel, is to keep out the foreign product with a design to raise the price of the home commodity. We encourage the importation of sugar because we must have it and we tax it because we want the revenue. This is in fullest accord with the principles of free trade. But we discourage and obstruct the importation of iron, steel, wool and a multitude of other commodities, laying a large duty on them, not for revenue but for obstruction, and the result is the robbery of the many for the benefit of the few.—*Daily Oregonian, June 30, 1882.*

The complaint about sugar is that we did not reduce enough. We have dealt more harshly with sugar than with any other article we have left on the dutiable list. Yet gentlemen on the other side tell us that we have been sectional; that we have protected sugar and rice and aimed at the destruction of Northern industries. The charge is absurd. We have not looked at the section where any article is produced in order to determine what we would do. We have tried to deal fairly with all, and in doing so find that we have cut it far heavier than iron, or glass, or earthenware, or woolens, or cottons, or hemp, or jute, or flax. In short, the cut on sugar is nearly twice as much as all the others put together, except woolens. [Applause.] But, on correct principles of taxation, there ought to be a higher duty on sugur than any other article on the dutiable list.

* * * * * * *

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get by the present duty on sugar and molasses about $58,000,000 per annum. According to the estimate of the gentleman on the other side who offered the amendment for free sugar and a bounty for the sugar grower, the present rate of duty affords protection to the domestic sugar grower equal to $6,000,000; so that the whole cost to the people is $64,000,000. In order to get $62,000,000 of revenue from manufacturers of iron and steel, and woolen and cotton goods, the people have to pay $500,000,000 to $600,000,000. —*Mill's Speech on the Mills Bill.*

"Mr. Carlisle is in no sense a free trader. There is no reason to be frightened over Mr. Carlisle's intentions, and the republicans who are commencing an alarmist's campaign for 1884 are making a mistake."

Reduction of Taxes.

[Daily Oregonian, December 14, 1883.]

In refusing to join in the attempts to alarm the people, which many republicans have made because the democrats did not follow their advice and elect Mr. Randall speaker, we should not be misunderstood to favor any policy which will be disastrous to the general interests of the country. The fact of excessive taxation is universally conceded, and the only practical question is in what direction shall the necessary reduction be made. We believe with the New York *Times* that the proper direction for reduction to take is toward the relief of manufacturers, the stimulation of trade, the extension of markets, the employment of labor, and not toward cheapening the mischievous luxuries of the smoker and the drinker. We think that freer development for American trade and industry, and a free breakfast table for American workers, are better than a free bar. The high protectionists on the other hand are in favor of retaining or increasing the duty on imports of all kinds and the remission of all liquor and tobacco taxes, or the retention of these and the distribution of the surplus among the states, the collection of the liquor tax for the benefit of the states, or the diversion of the internal revenue to the support of education. Judging by his utterances and his votes, Mr. Carlisle is in no sense a radical free trader. He does not think that free trade would be wise or practicable for the United States for many years. "When we speak of this subject," he says, "we refer to approximate free trade, which has no idea of crippling the growth of home industries, but simply of scaling down the iniquities of the tariff schedule, where they are utterly out of proportion to the demands of that growth. After we have calmly stood by and allowed monopolies to grow fat, we should not be asked to make them bloated. Our enormous revenues are illogical and oppressive. It is entirely undemocratic to continue these burdens on the people for years and years after the requirements of protection have been met with, and the representatives of these industries have become incrusted with wealth." There is no reason to be frightened over Mr. Carlisle's intentions, and the republicans who are commencing an alarmist campaign for 1884 are making a mistake. The people are in advance of their leaders on this subject. Many of the leaders have been left already, and there is danger that more will be.

The Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the National revenue by repealing the taxes on tobacco, which are an annoyance and a burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes; and by such revision of the tariff as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which cannot be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the government, *we favor the entire repeal of the internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system at the joint behests of the whisky trusts and the agents of foreign manufacturers. —Republican National Platform, 1888.*

The proposal to abolish internal taxes, while keeping up the excessive and even prohibitory duties levied under the existing system of "protection," means cheap whisky and dear clothing; an untaxed beer barrel and an excessive tax on iron in every form; free tobacco and dear salt; cheap cheroots and high-priced printing paper. The purpose of all this is to assure continuance of enormous profits to eastern iron masters, salt boilers, wood pulp proprietors, and the whole train of monopolists who are "protected" at the expense of the consumers of the country.—*Daily Oregonian, Oct. 26, 1881.*

A Great Discovery.

[Daily Oregonian, November 27, 1882.]

All the taxes that spirituous liquors and tobacco can be made to pay should be collected. That is, the taxes on those commodities should be kept at as high a rate as possible without creating incentives to fraud and so defeating the object. Another thing, if we strike off the one hundred millions of revenue annually obtained by the national treasury through these taxes, then no modification of the tariff on imports will be possible. There is a tax on all the necessaries of life, amounting to probably $500,000,000 a year, which is paid by consumers, of which however, only about one-third goes into the national treasury, while the other two-thirds are divided as special bounties among favored individuals and corporations. Free trade in these necessary commodities is not expected or desired, but a reasonable modification and reduction of the rates of duty ought to be granted. At any rate, whisky and tobacco ought not be the only free articles which the American citizen is allowed to buy and consume.

A Characteristic Ruse.

[Daily Oregonian, October 26, 1881.]

Mr. Wharton Barker, of Barker Bros. & Co., bankers of Philadelphia, has addressed to Senator Morrill, of Vermont, a letter urging the abolition of all internal taxes. This letter has been mailed to all the leading newspapers of the country. The following note addressed to editors accompanies it:

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 6, 1881.

DEAR SIR: I beg to call your attention to the inclosed letter to Senator Morrill, of Vermont, and I will thank you to inform me what objections, if any, you have to the proposal for abolition of internal taxes.

It is my desire to obtain the views of prominent men, so that the question can be properly presented to Congress in December."

The letter addressed to Senator Morrill argues the proposition at length. But the argument is not conclusive. It omits all mention of the real reason why the proposition is submitted. Philadelphia is the center of our "protective" tariff system. Men like Mr. Barker perceive that the country is growing restive under the exactions of this system, and that there is an increasing demand for a modification of it. To anticipate this demand and foil it is the object of the effort of which the protectionists are making for the abolition of internal taxes.

This, however, is by no means the only objection to the proposal. By far the greater part of the revenue raised by internal taxation is derived from liquors (spirituous and malt), and from tobacco. These are the very articles which ought to be taxed so long as taxes are required for any purpose whatever. The proposal to abolish internal taxes, while keeping up the excessive and even prohibitory duties levied under the existing system of "protection," means cheap whisky and dear clothing; an untaxed beer barrel and an excessive tax on iron in every form; free tobacco and dear salt; cheap cheroots and high-priced printing paper. The purpose of all this is to assure continuance of enormous profits to Eastern iron masters, salt boilers, wood pulp proprietors, and the whole train of monopolists who are "protected" at the expense of all the consumers of the country. No! Let us continue to tax consumers of whisky, beer and tobacco, and have cheaper clothing, cheaper sugar and salt, cheaper railroad iron, cheaper ship-building materials and cheaper tools for our farmers and mechanics. Besides all these, there are things without end which, if they could be had cheaper, would be better for a country than free whisky and untaxed tobacco. Therefore we are not able to agree with Mr. Barker on the repeal of the internal tax laws, in order that the consumer of the country may be robbed indefinitely for the benefit of protected monopolists. Take off the prohibitary duty on iron, so that we may have cheap ships and get low freights. This would be of more value o us of the Pacific coast than cheap whisky or tobacco without price.

Circulars of this sort show that there is to be a concerted effort on the part of the protectionists to save their advantages by making war on the internal revenue system. To meet it the press of the country ought to be vigilant and outspoken. They who have been accustomed to the benefits of class legislation will employ every ruse to hold them.

Mischievous Methods.

[Daily Oregonian, July 27, 1882.]

* * * * * * *

The inspiration of this bill (to create a tariff commission) is a plan of the extreme protectionists to reduce the taxes on whisky, beer and tobacco in order that there may be excuse for continuing the burden of the "protective" system in favor of monopolists. Though everything else be taxed we must have free whisky, beer and tobacco; otherwise the American citizen, born to an inheritance of freedom, will never know what true liberty is. And yet who will be benefited by the reduction of these taxes? Beer will still be five or ten cents a glass. Whisky two drinks for a quarter, and tobacco in all its forms, the same price as now. The money taken from the treasury, will go into the pockets of brewers, distillers and tobacconists, to swell the enormous gains already made by the manufacturers of articles which are a perennial nuisance and cumulative curse to mankind. The revenues from liquors and tobacco are the very revenues which never ought to be given up. They are derived from articles which ought to be taxed to as high a point as they will bear without incurring danger of frauds upon the revenue. Long experience has produced a system for collection of these taxes which is as perfect as anything can be. The laws work smoothly and are easily enforced, and the revenues derived from these articles are enormous and constantly increasing.

Taxation of liquors and tobacco relieves legitimate industries of taxation, provides money for internal improvements and for payments on the public debt, and yet oppresses nobody. Manufacturers of these articles do, indeed, complain, but certainly they are all making money fast enough, and if they were not the way is open to them to go into better business. The one thing Congress ought to do is to adjourn.

"Great Britain pays higher average wages, under free trade, than either France or Germany, under protection, and the United States pays relatively no higher wages in her crowded mining districts, in proportion to the relative cost of living, than Great Britain."

The East and the Tariff.

[Daily Oregonian, April 30, 1887.]

Harvey N. Shepard, an eminent Boston merchant, recently addressed the New England Club on the necessity of tariff reform. Protection, practically, is lavished upon a few favored industries, and tells Brown that his trade must take its chance with foreign competitors while Smith's is guarded by a tax so high as to shut out foreign competition. The United States, France and Germany try to protect their manufactures by restrictive duties. Great Britain's manufactures have to face the world without protection. What is the result? Here is Mr. Shepherd's answer:

"Great Britain sells in Germany twice what is sold by the French and three times what is sold by us; in France one and one-half times what is sold by the Germans and twice what is sold by us; and here twice what is sold by the French and four times what is sold by the Germans."

Great Britain does not do this because she pays less wages, for she pays higher average wages under free trade than either France or Germany under protection, and the United States pays relatively no higher wages in her crowded mining districts, in proportion to the relative cost of living, than Great Britain. Before 1860, under a very low tariff, we led all nations in shipbuilding; to-day our shipyards, that were once vocal with the sound of ax, saw and hammer, are silent, and last year Maine did not build a single ship. Protection has killed shipbuilding by making a vessel cost from $20 to $30 a ton more in Bath, Me., than across the line in New Brunswick. Measured by our intelligence, our free institutions, our vast line of seacoast, our restless, indomitable industrial energy and talent for trade, we ought to be the greatest maritime and commercial nation on the face of the globe; yet we are the least among the great powers of the earth. The foreign trade of Great Britain is more than $100 per head of the population; that of France $45; of Germany $35, and our own about $25. In soil, in industrial skill and talent, in mining wealth, in water power, we are the richest nation on the earth, but Great Britain beats us because food and raw material go into Great Britain free, and therefore she can manufacture more cheaply and undersell France, Germany and the United States in the markets of the world. Last year the sum of $100,000,000 was paid to Great Britain by the United States for ocean freight, and a large part of this freight money might be in our pockets if our tariff, called protective, had not obliterated our shipping and turned over to England the carrying trade of the world on the high seas. The answer of high tariff men to the logic of these hard facts is the specious plea of protection to native industries. Mr. Shepherd answers this argument at length, and we quote elsewhere what he says on the subject of wool. The tariff iron may shut out foreign competition, but it kills our own iron trade with other countries. Mexico, South America, Australia and Asia buy millions of dollars' worth of iron from Great Britain and none from us, because "Great Britain could and did take in return for iron, wool, copper, hemp and linseed, while our tariff forbids us to buy them. If we would reduce the duties upon iron, wool, copper and linseed, the excellence of our iron and steel would win a market for them in the remotest corners of the world."

"The talk of protecting American labor is a juggle and a farce since the system does not protect, but, on the contrary, actually oppresses the larger part of the labor of the country."

A Burden on Agriculture.

[Daily Oregonian, November 15, 1881.]

The New York *Times* in a series of articles on the exactions and oppressions of our tariff laws, is taking up the schedule item by item for illustrations. In a recent issue it shows how the agricultural interests of the country are affected almost injuriously by the heavy and almost prohibitory duty on railway steel. On first cost of railway building this burden is fully $3000 a mile, and on renewals it is a constant and heavy tax. The *Times* justly protests against the wrong and injury of loading our American grain with such a burden in competition with foreign grain. "It may be said," the *Times* remarks, "that the tariff secures to American farmers the home market, but it does not. The price of grain here is ultimately fixed abroad, whatever may be its fluctuations. The average home price is determined by that of the surplus exported, and necessarily. Therefore the duty on steel and iron not only hampers the competition of American grain abroad, but it lowers the rate of profits on the whole crop." It is not only on railway iron and steel that the tariff hurts the farmer, but on iron and steel in all forms in which these products are to be used in connection with agriculture. For all the "protection" which manufacturers get other classes have to pay. Since the farmers are in one way or another the chief consumers the principal part of the burden falls on them. All others who pay the tax—as railroad people and wagon and plough makers—have a chance to recoup, but they recoup mainly at the expense of agriculture. It is said, however, that the labor employed in manufactures has the benefit of high wages. But where are the farmer's wages? A Chicago paper before us boasts that men employed in the steel works of that city receive from four to ten dollars a day. It calls these rates "freedom and comfort wages," and asks us to note what protection does. But what does the farmer get? Where are his "freedom and comfort wages?" How many farmers actually realize two dollars a day for their labor to say nothing of a profit on their investment in land? The talk of "protecting" American labor is a juggle and farce, since the system does not protect, but, on the contrary, actually oppresses the larger part of the labor of the country. To support a comparatively few manufacturers and give them large profits it grinds down the great agricultural classes of the country, who are our most numerous and useful laborers.

"The lumber duty is the most inexcusable folly and iniquity of the whole monstrous bundle of iniquities and absurdities called the tariff law."

The Lumber Tariff.

[Daily Oregonian, February 21, 1883.]

The lumbermen of this country, so far as their views have found expression, care nothing one way or another about the question of free lumber. The business is here so well adjusted upon the proper basis of supply and demand that they have no fear of competition with British Columbia. In any event, there is no danger of over supply or reduced price. But in the old northwest there is much division of sentiment. Lumbermen are opposed to removal or reduction of the tariff because, they frankly say, it will bring Canada lumber into the country and reduce the price. From the point of view of the consumers of lumber, who outnumber the dealers several hundred to one, these are excellent reasons for reducing or removing the duty. From the point of view of the national good, without reference to the cost of the article, a change in the law which will increase the importation of lumber, and check the rapid consumption of our own pine, is most desirable. The lumber duty is the most inexcusable folly and iniquity of the whole monstrous bundle of iniquities and absurdities called the tariff law. It cuts two ways. It taxes the consumer to encourage the destruction of the forests. Lumber is a peculiar product, in that it is limited in quantity, and, once the supply is exhausted, cannot be replaced for several generations. The law should study the preservation of the forests instead of encouraging their extinction, should stimulate instead of prohibiting the importation of supplies from other countries.

"The unprotected classes not only supply the whole country with their products free of bounty, but exported a surplus exceeding $800,000,000 last year, turning the balance of trade heavily in our favor, paying off our foreign indebtedness and diffusing prosperity over the land in defiance of the high tariff handicapping of pampered greed, which, like the horse leech's daughter, cries always for more."

Protected and Non-Protected Industry.

[Daily Oregonian, January 28, 1882.]

* * * * * * *

Thus it appears that ninety per cent of our exported products are of the "non-protected" and only ten per cent of the "protected" class. Fifty millions of people are taxed constantly to the extent of 40 to 100 per cent on all the manufactured goods they consume. This tax is collected of the consumers whether they use imported or domestic manufactures, and was imposed for the purpose of giving to the capital and labor of one-tenth of the people a special bounty or subsidy under the fallacious pretense that it would add to the wealth of the whole country. Yet out of the nearly $800,000,000 surplus products of the country exported to foreign nations this subsidized and protected class contributed less than ten per cent. The unprotected classes not only supply the whole country with their products free of bounty, but exported a surplus exceeding $800,000,000 last year, turning the balance of trade heavily in our favor, paying off our foreign indebtedness and diffusing prosperity over the land in defiance of the high tariff, handicaping of pampered greed, which, like the horseleech's daughter, cries always for more.