nome monopolles rather than to protect the wages of the working-

countries is substantially equalized is apparent from the fact that money can now be had on undoubted security where exemption from excessive taxation is assured) at about as low rates in American as in England. It used to be said that American capital could not compete with British capital, and that compete with British capital, and that protection was as necessary for American capital as for American labor. This part of the argument is substantially overthrown. But the doctrine that our labor must be protected by duties virtually prohibitery, persists still. It is the stronghold of the advocates of protection. And yet we conceive it to be an entire fallacy—a fallacy lurking in a -sided and partial view of subject.

Ine more foreign goods we take, the certain truths of political acience. We must pay for our imports by our exports. We can pay for them in no other way. ports, and by consequence must stimulate the demand for home labor. In her in the matter of cheap capital system."
Since she has food to import, taking much of it from us, and larger part of upon the her raw materials also, than we, and statesmen now demand that the protecting her old advantage over us in capitive principle shall be further extended tal is virtually at an end, we need not fear her competition. Our system now tends to foster home monopolies rather than to protect the wages of the workingman. It is admitted too, that it bears hard on a people situated as we are on the Pacific slope. It at once restricts our trade with the only customers who out remunerative employment through our remunerative employment through on the state senate authorizing cities to "establish public improvement industries, under a board of managers, whose duty it shall be to give employment to legal residents who are in destitute circumstances, and with our remunerative employment through take our products, and forces us to pay no fault of their own. higher prices for goods which we as the Philadelphia Times says, "would are compelled to buy. Since the take money out of the workingman's adoption of free trade by Great right hand pocket and put it into his left Britain, wages in that country hand pocket, and say: 'See what I am have gone up on the whole average more doing to help you.'" And yet it desthan one-quarter, and in some departments fully one-half. Experience here comes in against theory in the matter of alleged reduction of wages. But grantfor a certain few of the people by taxing ing that wages night be somewhat reduced, there would be compensation for it in cheaper goods, which working peochist in cheaper goods, which working peochist without protection. It would not ple, as well as others, must consume. be right to attribute the prevailing dis-Moreover, wages are not a great ele-ment in the cost of manufacturing. We to the tariff alone. But the fact that ment in the cost of manufacturing. We to the tarm atom. But the have not the figures of the census of there is so much distress shows that the 1880 and hence we draw from those of tariff alone cannot prevent it. The 1870 for illustrations on this point. 1870, for illustrations on this point. situation is another illustration of the These figures show that wages then were truth of the lines which Dr. Johnson put 19.40 per cent. of the value of the product in the manufacturing, mechanical, mining and fish industries of the United States. The value of the material used was 54 19 per cent. of the product, while the remaining 23.41 per cent. was due to buildings, machinery and so on. If we call wages 20 per cent. of the whole value of the product and admit that wages are 40 per cent. higher here than in England, then the difference is but 40 of the whole value. Nothing could show more convincingly that the interests of domestic labor are not at stake here to the extent which the protectionists claim. England lets in raw material. We tax all raw material from reasons why tariff revision should be make goods dear. True, it professes abroad to "protect" one interest or another. The consequence is an advancourse it does not discuss the question,. But it defeats itself, because its consetake over us in free materials, which but it collects and presents facts which quences reappear in the higher prices of vantage which she can have in cheaper labor. We can manufacture as cheaply to all who will study them. Among the as she can, if we would avail ourselves false claims of protection it explodes is of all our opportunities and that without the pretense that our almost prohibitory materially reducing wages either. But as all tariff taxes, like other taxes, must of necessity re-appear in higher commo-dities, of what avail is it to the workingman to keep up his wages by artificial same time and

up at a high rate too? * off a dog's tail and cars the same day he the iron and steel industry is secretary has reason to feel highly amused, enter- of the American Iron and Steel Assotained and grateful, as to say that a tariff ciation and not likely to furnish figures on coal, which enables the coal combina-tion to restrict production, which reduces simply with that end in view. Iron and the earnings of the miner and artificially steel are the most highly protected of all puts up the price of coal, thus swelling articles in common use. In 1880 there the cost of the workingman's fuel, was were 805 companies producing iron ore, 'protection' to labor."

Protection that Kills.

[Daily Oregonian, October 9, 1886.] It was only the other day that the great coal companies met in New York and arbitrarily put up the price of one of the prime necessities of life, viz., fuel. How were they able to do it? We answer, by securing monopoly of the home market through a protective tariff, and then compared total number employed in the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.30 each, their service coming more under the head of skilled labor than that of the miners. This is certainly a beginning the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$184,923 a day or \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the production of pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the pig and bar iron and steel was 140,975, who received \$1.00 each, their service coming more than the pig and bar iron and the pig and bar iron and the pig and bar iron and the pig through a protective tariff, and then com-bining to restrict production and putting prices artificially high. What is the re-less protected industries of the country. prices artificially high. What is the result? The coal miner's earnings for the year are cut down below the level of the English miner and the price of the workingman's fuel is increased. Where does "the protection" of the workingman come in in this case? You might as well say that if you cut off a dog's tail and ears the same day he has reason to feel highly amused, entertained and grate ful, as to say that a tariff on coal, which enables the coal combination to restrict production, which reduces the earnings the miner, and to artificially put up the price of coal, thus swelling the cost of the workingman's fuel, was "protec-

of the workingman's luel, was protection" to labor.

A meeting of operatives in the textile industries of Pennsylvania last spring framed a petition to Congress, in which they said: "It is no longer necessary to scour Europe to find pauper labor. We have it here in our iron and coal mines, working for 75 cents a day, and skilled working for 75 cents a day, and skilled operatives in our cotton and woolen mills working for less than 80 cents per day." The pauper labor of Italy is takilding and road work, the Poles and Hungarians swarm in the coal fields According to the testimony collected by the Pennsylvania State Bureau of Statistics, whose chief is a protectionist, from the lips of English miners, the condition of the miner is worse in Pennsylvania than in Great Britain. The British miner works less hours in the day, but more days in the year; he does not get as high wages in money, but he does not pay high rent, his fuel is very cheap; nor is he swindled by company stores. The English miner gets house, garden and coal for 25 cents a month and the company pays the taxes on the house. He gets medical attendance and medicine at the same rate when needed. While it is true as a general fact that the average of wages in the United States is

retire from action; he put his glass to his blind eye and swore he could not see the signal. Blaine don't wish to see and shelters himself behind his blind eye.

By the operations of a protective tariff, "the Government undertakes to make employment for a certain few of the people by taxing all the rest."

The more foreign goods we take, the more labor we must employ at home. To the protectionist this may appear a paradox; and yet it is one of the most certain truths of political science. We construct the protection of the most advantages, such as they are, of a high tariff; and yet its miners are working for starvation wages and many of the mills are idle. The farmers have also been instructed by the advantage of protection. instructed by the advocates of protection that it would make their business profit-Our exports are created by home labor. The more we buy of foreigners, the more home labor, therefore, we must employ to create the article to pay for what we buy. If free trade increases our imports, it must therefore iggrease our exports, and by consequence must stimulate the demand for home labor. In falls so low in the midst of great industry of the state of the s falls so low, in the midst of great indus-tries that demand high protection in orother words, every foreign purchase necessitates the employment of domestic labor to create that with which the purchase is made. We have the advantage of England in variety and abuntage of each materials and in food last content to the midst of great industrials so low, in the midst of great industrials so low, in the midst of great industrials to learn the midst of great industrials to low, in the midst of great industrials to low. dance of raw materials, and in food. last quarter of a century, perhaps it We are substantially on an equality with would be best to try a more bracing

> To relieve the prevailing distress a bill has been introduced in the state senate This proposition into one of Goldsmith's poems:

> How small of all the ills that men endure That part which kings or laws can cause or cure

tection it (the census of 1880) ex-plodes is the pretense that our almost prohibitory tariff makes work plenty and keeps wages high.".

Protection and Wages.

| Daily Oregonian, August 2, 1882]

The census of 1880 is full of excellent reasons why tariff revision should be by the same process the manufactured most strongly protected would be a sufficient reply, but the census report makes a more elaborate one though in the same direction. The man whom the govern-"You might as well say that if you cut ment commissioned to make a report on and they produced 7,971,703 tons, employing to do the work 31,668 persons at a daily cost of \$31,791, a few cents over \$1 per day for each person, which is less than the average of workers in any unprotected business in the country. The total number employed in the produc The Free Trade League of New York has issued a pamphlet which deals in a

forcible manner with the infant industry plea. In this connection it says: "In the first place our infant industries are a the first place our infant industries are a century old. In the second the compiler of these statistics acknowledges that our superior skill places the world at a disadvantage with us Thirdly, our coal and iron are generally situated so close together that the former can easily be worked with the latter. Fourthly, while the iron and of Europe and of the iron and coal of Europe are far down below the surface ours are almost upon it. Fifthly, our iron and coal supplies are in close proximity to the market. Sixthly, they are adjacent to the great food producing center of the United States, which is relied upon to supply half the food eaten by the iron workers of Europe. Therefore, without any pro-tection at all it is shown our iron masters could afford to pay one hundred per cent more wages to their workmen than they do before foreign competition would affect them." But the protectionists do not care for demonstrations. When the next presidential campaign comes on they will have their threats to working men posted up in their furnaces, factories and mills, just as they did in 1880, and not until the people who labor turn their thinking to some account, stop striking and redress their grievances by voting will they make a positive advance toward independence and better circum-

The laborers in unprotected industries in this country receive higher wages relatively than the operatives in protected indus-

The Wages in Europe and

with those of England have been due to the tariff; that if the tariff was taken off our cotton and woolen goods, wages would be as low here as in England. The allacy of this reasoning is shown by the act that the bricklayer, who has no tariff to protect him, maintains his wayes at a higher point relatively than the operatives in protected industries and so does the unprotected carpenter, plumber pleaters relatively than the control of the control o plumber, plasterer, slater, blacksmith, etc. In Germany, a country with a high protective tariff, wages are lower than agriculture nor manufactures are doing well under the coddling system of the last quarter of a century, perhaps it would be best to try a more bracing system."

Having become accustomed to depend upon the Government, the Pennsylvania statesmen now demand that the protective principle shall be further extended.

To relieve the following protective tariff, wages are lower than in free trade England. According to Consul Warner, of Coloque, in Upper Siliesia a workman in one of the protected industries earns only 47 cents a day, and if a skilled laborer he gets 80 a day, and if a skilled laborer works from 6 to 6 in summer and 7 to 7 in winter. The in summer and 7 to 7 in winter. The laborer in that protection country is sparingly supplied with clothing and linen, and a white shirt is to be seen only on rare occasions. For such articles of luxury he has no money to spare, and he is frequently compelled to bargain for old and cast off clothes. His meals consist principally of vegetables, the dinner being of rettered. being of potatoes, peas, beans, common pork and black bread.

> "But at least we can let it be known that we are not so gullible as to accept without protest, and resulting injustice and loss of the policy of protection."

Shipbuilding and Protection.

[Oregonian, December 16, 1880.]

facturers. Conscious that the whole system would fall if the false foundations on which it stands were exposed, they band together and refuse to allow it to from foreign countries would be shipped be attacked in any part. We want to under free trade, in any considerable sell to Great Britain, but our tariff pro-hibits Great Britain from selling to us. and do force us to pay enormously high prices for nearly all manufactured goods. This is the direct and sole object of a protective tariff. In other words, a protective tariff is a tax levied on imported goods with the design to raise the price of home commodities. Protection is set up as a barrier to trade. Its object is to Great Britain to encourage direct dealprosperity we now enjoy is the re-chiefly of exporting the surplus of of exporting the surplus of our crops. What would be the effect upon that prosperity if Great Britain should levy such duty on American breadstuffs as would make it profitable to develop the agricultural resources of Australia and the railway system of Russia? Our largest customer will not always pay her balance in cash, nor is it our interest that she should do so. She wants our products and we want hers.

But these men must be hypocrites for

Daily Oregonian, March 31, 1883.]

Condition of the working class, as a whole, is better, it is not true in those very mining districts and industries we tax ourselves so heavily to protect. John L. Butler, chief assistant of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Industrial Statistics, in a recent speech declared that all tarists are injurious to labor, and the

"Our system now tends to foster home monopolies rather than to protect the wages of the working man."

Philadelphia Record, anti-protection organ, has the largest circulation of any paper in the state. Mr. Blaine and his school treat all these facts as Lord Nellogo bricklayers, 40, 000 bricklayers and masons in Paris and the signal of the admiral was flying to retire from action; he put his glass to his blind eye and swore he could not see the value of capital in the two value of the weather with building operations. Wile in London there are estimated to be 25,000 bricklayers, 40, work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find it as difficult to conceive work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find it as difficult to conceive work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find it as difficult to conceive work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find it as difficult to conceive work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find it as difficult to conceive work in a cotton mill at Nashua, New will find i There is, says the Boston Herald, "in proportion to the number of inhabitants, a much larger amount of work performed in New York than either of the three named European capitals; and, while it is said that in London, Paris and Barlin."

and the board of guardians of the poor contributed to the outfit necessary for their voyage. The benificent laws of our country imposes a duty averaging thirty-five per cent on cotton goods for the benefit of the owners of this Nashua mill and of others in the same business. named European capitals; and, while it is said that in London, Paris and Berlin quite a proportion of these mechanics are out of work, in consequence of stagnation in the building trade, it is probable that the New York bricklayer who earns \$4 per day performs, in the course of the Hard Times in Pennsyl
vania.

[Daily Oregonian, April 8, 1885]

Although Pennsylvania enjoys more of the alleged benefits of the protective system than any other state in the union, it contains a greater number of unemployed or underpaid workingmen than any other. Its coal and lumber and manufacturing interests all enjoy the advantages, such as they are, of a high tariff; and yet its miners are working for starvation wages and many of the mills are idie. The farmers have also been instructed by the advocates of protection that it would make their here are the new York bricklayer who earns \$\frac{1}{2}\$ per day performs, in the course of the day's work, very considerable more service than the beday's work, very considerable more service that the course of the day's work, very considerable more service that the course of the day's work, very considerable more service than would be required of one similarly engaged on the other'side of the Atlantic. This would also account for the must be hypocrites, for they leave the Atlantic. This would also account for the imust be hypocrites, but for the sake of these help-less laborers, they ask the boon of thirty-five per cent protection. But these men must be hypocrites, for they leave the Atlantic. This would also account for the fact that 4,000 men seem to be able to do in New York what it takes 8,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men to do in Paris, a city of less size, and 40,000 men seem to be able to do in New York what it takes 8,000 men seem to be able to do in New York what it take

Protection of Wool.

Daily Oregonion, January 12, 1882 j tory," says the Salem Statesman, "there is produced annually at least a million pounds of wool. This sells at from 20 to 30 cents per pound, yielding to the farmers annually the sum of \$2,500,000. The ers annually the sum of \$2,500,000. The tariff on wool of the quality raised here is about 10 cents per pound, that is ten million dollars. Those who, like the Oregonian, advocate free trade, claim that the tariff on an article adds that much to the price; that is, the tariff on wool increases the price in Oregon ten cents per pound, giving to the farmers one million dollars annually. Absolute free trade, then, would take from the farmers one million dollars each year."

The claim that the farmers of Oregon The claim that the farmers of Oregon derive great benefit from the "protection" of their worl is urged by our protectionists on all occasions. They who urge it seem to imagin that it fully answers all objections to the tariff system as an oppressive one to our section in assertion as the advantage. our section, inasmuch as the advantages we receive from the protection of our wool exceed the losses we suffer through the obstruction of trade and the enhancement of prices for the benefit of Eastern manufacturers. But the fact is that our wool here is not protected at as if we were perfectly satisfied all. Wool of a quality equal to ours is therewith, the sophisms and the worth more in London than our wool is worth here. Latest London quotations show prices ranging all the way from 12 cents for the poorest to 45 cents for the best. The average is better than the 20 to 30 cents a pound which the Statesman boastingly says our farmers receive.

We send our surplus wool to the
Eastern States. The route is a long, and fact is this destructive policy is maintained as part of the whole scheme of protection, which rules our laws for the benefit of the great eastern manufacturers. Conscious that the whole whole, an advantage over ours. from the protection of wool is infinites-simal, if it is anything. We suppose that no one would imagine that wool from foreign countries would be shipped,

quantities into Oregon to compete with the home product when better prices The laws cannot compel our citizens to might be realized by shipping to Glas build ships at losing rates, but they can gow or London. "There is no phase of protection that will bear examination. Every part of the system is as weak as the argument for the protection of wool. The system is throughout a short-sighted game of greed, except for the great monopolist whom

The Tariff on Wool.

all commodities which the workman, as Times says: "The wool growers (of

wages of labor in it. But is there any real gain in concentrating capital and labor in one employment by artificial stimulants and withdrawing from others? Our protective system has, beyond doubt, stimulated certain manufactures; but it is equally certain that it has destroyed others. Thus it has enough the system of the one? Oregon is boasted as a wool-growing State, and so it is; and yet even in Oregon, there are twenty persons who want cheap clothes to one who wants dear wool. Here, in a dozen words of one syllable, is a camplete and overwhelming answer to all the elaborhas destroyed others. Thus it has enabled eleven mills to monopolize the manufacture of steel rails at high prices and great profits, but it has annihilated ship building and the profits of ocean commerce. While one industry is stimulated by this system another is depressed. That is to say, all that any interest or any class gains by profection is gained always at the expense of some other interest or class. Every wave of the ocean has a depression behind it.

The prosperity of the west and south depends on their selling their products depends on their selling their products phase of protection that will bear ex to Great Britain. We do not take her amination. Every part of the system is goods because our tariff prohibits them, but force her to pay the balance in cash. Of what advantage is this to us when we are obliged at once to pay out that cash for goods at higher prices than those at which we should be enabled to buy them them it is a studied and profound game of the great management. greed—except for the great monopolist whom it creates and supports. With them it is a studied and profound game direct of the customer who takes our products? Another thing. Our policy makes it distinctly to the interest of Great Britain to encourage direct deal-

"Why should our industries here be taxed to create an industry at

The Tin-plate Tax.

[Daily Oregonian, January 20, 1883.] There is an industry here that is very much interested in tin-plate. It wants tin-plate to be as cheap as possible, so But the protectionist sits as toll gatherer at the gate, and for his own profit prohibits the exchange of products. Of course we are obliged to submit as we of the agricultural states have small power board of trade and Astoria's chamber of that something may be made out of the in the national Congress. But at least we can let it be known that we are not commerce have protested Similar pro-tes's have been addressed to Congress from other quarters. Many newspapers have joined in the effort to prevent the we can let it be known that we are not so gullible as to accept without protest, and as if we were perfectly satisfied therewith, the sophisms and the resulting injustice and loss of the policy of and means committee have been induced to advance the rate by a statement from the policy of the effect that if Congress Pittsburg to the effect that if Congress will sufficiently protect the tin-plate industry "it will provide a livelihe they leave the American laborer to starve while they run their mills with 'paupers' should our industry here be taxed to create an industry at Pittsburg? Is it for for the master and not for the man." Current Talk on the Tariff

Question.

Question.

The chicago The line and state the case of the will not pay to make the plates without protection, it is because men can do better at something else and for no other reason that it It is growing clearer every day that the American laborer will never be adequately protected until the pauper latings at which they can make a living without taxing their neighbors. To take them from doing those things and set them at things at which they cannot earn a living their neighbors.

policy could ever have prevailed as they now find it to account for the perversity which once denied free-dom of speech and press, or the infatuation which believed in witchcraft and slavery."

Tariff Policy. [Daily Oregonian, April 19, 1882.]

The English duty list comprises just fifteen commodities. They are the following: Tobacco, tea, coffee, chocolate and cocoa, wine (classed as one), dried and cocoa, wine (classed as one), dried fruit, chicory, spirits, gold and silver plate (classed as one), beer, vinegar, playing cards, pickles, malt and spruce. This is the whole list of commodities on which England imposes tariff duties. The first five are commodities not produced in England; the duties on these cannot, therefore, be in any sense protective. With respect to the others the protective feature is obviated by the imposition of a corresponding averies duty. protective feature is obviated by the imposition of a corresponding excise duty on the like commodities produced in the British islands. Thus the English tariff is strictly and literally a tariff for revenue only. It creates no monopoly, licenses no spoliation, sanctions no practice of reciprocal rapine. It is not the product of jobbers banded together to force up prices of commodities in which they are personally interested, and to compel the consumer to pay them.

On the other hand the American tariff list comprises some four thousand articles or commodities, more than two thirds of which return practically no rev-

thirds of which return practically no revenue at all over the cost of collection.

The duties are not levied for revenue, but chiefly for the aggrandisement of a manufacturing class at the cost of consumers generally. Under a proper tariff manufacturing class at the cost of con-sumers generally. Under a proper tariff system the object is revenue for the use of the government. Under our system the object is the shutting out of compe-tition from abroad so that home monop-olies may charge what price they like. But we are told that our manufacturers

But we are told that our manufacturers cannot compete on equal terms with those of Europe. This requires us to believe that the incalculable national advantages of the United States are not enough to sustain manufacturers. Hence it is necessary to grant the American manufacturer the privilege of extorting an advance over the market price of his goods. As American manufactures are not and cannot be remunerative a sysnot and cannot be remunerative a sys-tem mus, be employed to enable the manufacturer to extort from the consumer a bonus over the natural price of the goods and so cover his losses and make a profit. This is the protective system on the showing of its own adve cates.

By whom is this bonus paid? By the

whole people, but chiefly by the working and agricultural classes, who are sad-dled with the burdens and have none of the benefits. But it is claimed that the

artisan is furnished with employment and the agriculturist with a "home mar-

The manufacturer is secured against loss by being privileged to exact high prices

from the consumer; but where protection for the workingman?

" How is the artisan protected

are no customs to keep out labor. Com-petition has unrestricted sway, and as a matter of fact the mass of toilers in the protected manufactures are foreigners, whose small pay in the great manufacturing states, as Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, gives them no advan-tage over the so-called pauper labor of England. Hence the distress, strikes England. Hence the distress, strikes and turbulence so constantly reported. True, wages are something higher, but only nominally so. The workingman io-es more by high prices than he gains by t'e better wages. Again, as to wages, the rotected employer does not pay his operatives on a philanthropic plan. He is ruled by the market rates, and he takes advantage to the fullest extent of the competition which the necessities of the competition which the necessities of [Daily Oregonian, June 10, 1882]
Advocating "protection," the Dalles
Times says: "The wool growers (of with their relations carry their lessons will as all others, must consume. In the long run, in the general scheme of things, the policy does not benefit our own laborers, for the more we buy of foreigners the more we must produce by hardly any formal answer is needed to that assertion. The anitagonistic relations of labor and capital in those sections whose industries are most strongly protected would be a sufficient reply, but the census report makes a more elaborate one though in the same of the production which so must be sufficient reply, but the census report makes and may even increase for a time the wages of labor in it. But is there are twenty persons who wear any real gain in concentrating capital between the foreign market. In fact the foreign market. In fact the foreign market regulates and may even increase for the workman, as well as all others, must consume. In the long run, in the general scheme of things, the policy does not benefit our own laborers, for the more we buy of foreigners the more we must produce by home labor to pay for it. Free interchange of commodities is the policy to stimulate home labor. In though protection were aban-doned wheat and corn and beef and pork would still be eaten. The farmer cannot lose his market. The "home market" if this assertion were true still it would not prove the protective policy to be a just and wise one. High prices for woolen goods; and there are twenty persons who wear and there are twenty persons who wear and there are twenty persons who wear woolen goods to one who produces wool.

Why should the twenty be taxed for the long run, in the general scheme of things, the policy does not benefit our own laborers, for the more we buy of foreigners the more we must produce by him guarantees a good price for their own guarantees a good price for their own laborers for the industry."

If this assertion were true still it would not prove the protective policy to be a just and wise one. High prices for woolen goods; and there are twenty persons who wear woolen market than in the foreign market. In fact the foreign market regulates and governs home market. American grain sells in the markets of the world on a par with the produce of the seris of Russia and Roumania, and the American farmer cannot help himself. He has no protection, and it is he who competes with "pauper labor." Hence, also, though protection cannot raise the price of a bushel of wheat by a single penny, it can and does repress and obstruct the export of our agricultural products. There are countless points to which the fruit of our soil might be shipped if we were per-mitted to take our pay in the commodi-ties there produced. We should not be forced to pay the enormous ocean freights exacted on the wheat we do export if vessels could carry cargoes both ways. But exchange is obstructed by law; there is no free exchange; "protection" allow only a partial and indirect trade, and partial and indirect trade means such costs for freights, insurance and exchange that the American farmer is beaten before he begins the competition.

But the progress and thrift of the country are appealed to as proofs that protection has been a benificent policy. All these policies in the competition of the country are appealed to as proofs that protection has been a benificent policy. is attributed to protection. It do

occur to those who look at the subject only in a superficial way that this proghas been gained in spite of it. The wealth of nature is here and all our errors of industrial policy cannot prevent its development. We have had slavery, droughts and pestilence, a great civi war, and we know not how many other moral and physical evils. Yet see how the country has prospered! Is its prosperity due to these evils? Has it not prospered in spite of them and of all the other evils it has ever known? So, too, other evils it has ever known? So, too, it has prospered in spite of "protection." No folly of our own can as yet overcome our great natural advantages. But here, indeed, is an almost incomprehensible folly. It is admitted that our people would trade freely with foreign nations if they were allowed. Their interest would lead them to it. Recognizing this fact in steps the man who wants to obfact, in steps the man who wants to ob-struct trade that he may get high prices, and induces the government to take his part. The time will come when men this obstructive and absurd policy could ever have prevailed as they now find it to account for the perversity which once denied freedom of speech and press, or the infatuation which believed in witch-

porary application, is seen to have be-come the means for gross abuses and systematic robbery and oppression.

"No imposition is too great to catch stupid people, and herein lies the great strength of our glorious protective system." Pro-tection is a legalized form of robthe bills of the Manufacturer.

Call for Tariff Reform. [Daily Oregonian, Feb. 15, 1882.]

But these incongruities of the system

But these incongruitles of the system are not to be removed. The steel monopoly, intrenched in power, refuses to allow revision of the tariff in the ready way of act of Congress, but proposes a commission, which may be ready to report in two or four years hence, or may never be ready. The object clearly is, first, to delay action as long as possible and, second, to secure a report from the commission which would defend the existing system and afford no relief to the country. Congress is controlled by the combined monopolies which are enabled by the laws to fleece and plunder the people; and what is even more discouraging is the fact that large numbers of the people are deluded and misled by the shallow sophistries put forth as arguments in support of the system by the beneficiaries of it. It is amazing that anyone should believe that these beneficiaries of the system are insisting on its maintainance ont of purely philanthropic motives. Their assertion that the laboring classes are interested in the maintainance of a high protective tariff is just what might be expected from that source. It is an essential part of the deception. If you are going to rob a man with his consent, and not only have him satisfied with it but even enthusiastic about it, you must first make the worst appear to him the better reason. Otherwise there will be trouble with him. No imposition is too gross to catch stupid people, and herein lies the great strength lows: imposition is too gross to catch stupid people, and herein lies the great strength of our "glorious protective system." Judging from the census returns, there are now probably three and a half millions of persons engaged in or concerned with manufactures and mechanical and mining industries in the United States. Now protection requires that forty-six and a half millions of people shall be taxed in order that these three millions and a half should have better wages. That is the theory of projection, not the fact. The fact is that it does not im prove the condition of the three millions and a half, while it does impose heavy sequences. burdens on all the rest. For example, in order that five Eastern manufacturing firms should be bolstered up, the price of steel, of which immense quantities are used, is doubled. Its effect is to make the shipper and passenger on all the railroads pay increased rates and to keep down the wages of railroad employees; to increase the cost of the farmer's tools and machinery, and at the same time to erect a barrier between him and the foreign consummer to whom his surplus products must be sold. It must be re-

products must be sold. It must be remembered, however, that protection does not protect a tithe of all the persons employed in manufacturing and mechanical industries. Its immediate benefits are limited to the line of industry bolstered up by it, and which therefore employ more hands than they otherwise might do. This is a very small proportion of the three and a half millions—probably not more than one million all told. It is neither honest nor philosophical to tell the working classes that their interests are all bound up with protection. and it is politically imprudent, for the reason that the agricultural class is very much larger than the standard class is very mechanical, and that its interests are most assuredly not identical with those of the protectionists. The necessity for tariff reform has been growing clearer for several years to all candid observers of national progress, and even the pro-tected manufacturers have seemed to tected manufacturers have seemed to realize that they could not much longer hope to fatten upon forced contributions and confiscations from the country at large. Removal of obstructions to trade is the natural philosophy of all who gain their living by work, though they are very apt to mistake their true interests. Protection is a legalized form of robbery, which diminishes the purchasing power of the wages of "protected" labor by artificially enhancing prices, which makes the farmer foot the bills of the manufacturer, which robs Peter to pay Paul. turer, which robs Peter to pay Paul which restricts production and commerce and which, therefore, is opposed to every rational and enlightened system of fiscal and industrial science. The question is now how much longer will this national abuse be upheld? No part of the country is pressed by it on the whole so severely as ours. We labor under all disadvantages which it creates, and have no share in its compensations such

Thus our labor suffers from e 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 clases are so plainly the victims of it, is phenominal and perhaps hopeless .-- Daily Oregonian, October 21, 1881.

"We tax the raw materials of the a way that protects nobody. It keeps out foreign wools that we need to mix with our native fleeces and by restricting the variety of fabrics which can be made here, limits the demand for American

Partisan Views of the Tariff.

[Daily Oregonian, July 7, 1883.]

A writer who presents the subject on rational instead of on partisan grounds, after showing that the annual value of the woel products of the country for the census year 1880 was \$41,033,045, and that the value of our exports of domestic woolens during the last fiscal year was only \$360,000, says with equal truth and force: "We tax the raw material of this industry in a way that protects nobody. It keeps out foreign wools that we need to mix with our native fleeces, and by restricting the variety of fabrics which can be made here, it limits the ever have prevailed as they now find it to account for the perversity which once denied freedom of speech and press, or the infatuation which believed in witch-craft and slavery.

"The mass of the people want justice instead of swindling, freedom instead of monopolles."

"A Live Question.

[Daily Oregonian, May 14, 1884]

Less than a hundred capitalists engaged in the Bessamer steel ring make two or three hundred per cent profit on their money invested, but they pay their workmen only the average wages, which provide a bare subsistence. The same is true in other protected industries. The tariff question can no more be smothered than could the slavery question a quar-

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.

"Manufacturing industry is fast-ened as a leech:upon agricultural industry and is gorging with the profits."

Agricultural Statistics.

[Daily Oregonian, February 13, 1882.] The statistician (report of the Commis oner of Agriculture for 1880) exhibits the relative importance of agriculture as a contributor to our export trade, as fol-

Total agricultural exports

These figures show in a most striking manner that our vast trade with foreign nations is the result chiefly of the work of the farmers. All other forms of industry in the United States are but trifling in comparison with that of agri-culture, and yet agriculture is not only not "protected," but is taxed to main-tain other industries which claim the favor of government. Manufacturing in-dustry is fastened as a leech upon agricultural industry and is gorging with the profits. In our eastern states, where la-bor is cheap and the market wide, manufor is cheap and the market wide, manufacturers accumulate colossal fortunes under this system, which taxes constantly the greatest industry of the country for their benefit. For our manufactures there is no foreign market worth naming since other natious undersell us in every part of the globe. Goods produced ander our system can't compete with those of other countries, and consequently can't secure a foreign market. But they monopolize the home market at high prices, as the duties are virtually prohibitory, and the consequence is that the American farmer, who is forced to meet the competition of the whole world in production of grain and cotton, is not petition in the purchase of manufactured commodities, but is obliged to pay the prices which pretected monopolists choose to exact. Our agricultare would choose to exact. Our agricultare would be infinitely more prosperous were it disburdened of this system and its con-

"What does Senator Edmunds or Mr. Blaine think to-day about their pet theory that a protective tariff makes a 'home market' for the American farmers' wheat, corn and pork by keeping out foreign goods? Does the American farmer seriously believe to-day that he is specially enriched by a protective tariff which promised to make for him a 'home market?' It looks very much as if wheat rose and fell without any reference to our protective tariff, as if wages were high or

Wheat and the Tariff.

[Daily Oregonian, November 4, 1886.] The Milling World recently said: The farmers of the United States would o-day be getting 20 cents a bushel less for their wheat than they now get were it not for the protective tariff of 20 cents a bushel imposed on imported wheat by our government." This is saying that protection raises the price of American wheat to the exact amount of the tariff tax laid on imported wheat, and thus puts \$90,000,000 or so a year into the pockets of our farmers, estimating the wheat crop at 450,000,000 bushels. This is absurd, because the price of our wheat is not affected at all by our tariff on imported wheat; the price of our whole crop depends on the price of our surplus, which is sold in the free market of Liverpool in competition with the surplus wheat of all other grain growing coun-tries. Of course, since our tariff on wheat cannot fix the price of wheat in Liverpool, it does not fix its price in Chicago. What does Senator Edmunds or Mr. Blaine think to-day about their t theory that a protective tariff makes "home market" for the American a "home market" for the American farmers' wheat, corn and pork by kee; ing out foreign goods? Does the American farmer seriously believe to-day that he is specially enriched by a protective tariff which promised to make for him a "home market?" It looks very much as if wheat rose and fell without any reference to our protective tariff, as if wages were high or low without reference. o a protective tariff.

"He is for Protecting one and dauntiesaly advocates the great principle that we all can get rich by taxing each other."

[Daily Oregonian, October 30, 1882.]

Mr. John Roach, the ship-builder was

Mr. John Roach, the ship-builder was recently before the tariff commission. He favored that body of investigators, as well as an excessively "protected" country, with his views, which the New York World has admirably condense and analyzed. He appeared in our characters; but it was in his che cater as farmer that he most enjoyed? He blessings of protection. As a farmer he enjoyed paying taxes to support himself as a ship-builder, minufacterer and from master; but after all it is to be feared that he enjoys himself as a ship-builder, minufacterer and iron master he takes more money out of other people's pockets than his own. At least when the characters united in his person are divided, it is the former that pays and grumbles and the ship-builder and the farmer who is only a farmer does not perceive the blessings of protection so clearly as the farmer who is also a protected manufacturer. Still there is a satisfaction in the old familiar fallacies of Mr. Roach. He is a protectionist, as he frankly avers, no matter if as a farmer he has to pay a dollar to secure as an of Mr. Roach. He is a protectionist, as he frankly avers, no matter if as a farmer he has to pay a dollar to secure as an iron master a large multiple of that sum. "I believe in protection," he remarks, "not for a single industry, but for one and all, because I believe in the principle of protection." This is refreshing, since most persons who come before the tariff commission believe very much in the protection "for a single industry" and possess none at all of the general philanthrophy which makes Mr. Roach's liberality include not only his own industries but all the interests with the representatives of which he can log-roll. He is for protecting "one and all," and dauntlessly advocates the great principle that we can all get rich by taxing each other, and by putting up prices on each other all round the wealth of the nation will be largely increased. The farmers of the country consider that they pay for this amusement, being the only protected class. They will be re-