

# SUPPLEMENT.

EXTRACTS TAKEN FROM

# THE DAILY OREGONIAN

## The Fallacies of PROTECTION!

From the Standpoint of  
the  
Daily Oregonian

"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 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 Dakies, 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

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,

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

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

to 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

"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 most 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 wrog 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."