





# Pamphlets on free Trade

HF

1713

P3

v. 3

MAIN



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

WHICH IS BEST FOR THE FARMERS,  
PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

AN ADDRESS

BEFORE THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY OF LANCASTER COUNTY,  
DELIVERED AT LANCASTER CITY, PA., FEBRUARY 7, 1887,

BY

THOMAS H. DUDLEY,

OF CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY.



ANSWER TO COL. BEVERLY, OF VIRGINIA,  
AND HON. FRANK HURD, OF OHIO.







*Mr. President and Gentlemen:—*

It is always unfortunate when any question relating to political economy is introduced into politics, and doubly unfortunate when such a question as Protection or Free Trade is introduced.

It is discussed often by men who know nothing about it, simply because it has been incorporated into the party platform, and opposed by men equally ignorant, because it has been condemned by the other party.

Protection is either right or wrong; is a benefit or else an injury; and it should be examined and considered calmly and dispassionately as to whether it promotes or retards the prosperity and welfare of the country.

The examination should be a practical one, and not from a theoretical standpoint. Many things are very beautiful in theory, but when applied practically, under new or different conditions, are perfect failures. You might as well prescribe the same bill of fare for all mankind as to attempt to apply the same theory in political economy to all nations. What may be good for England, with her redundant population and her peculiar climate and soil, may not be suited to the people of the United States, with our sparse population, our great abundance of land, and genial climate. Hence the theory that works in one country may not work in another. Therefore the statesman should look at it from a practical, rather than a theoretical, standpoint. Outside of Switzerland no civilized country in the world has ever adopted Free Trade. England has not now, and never has had, Free Trade; she has a tariff for revenue only; and next to the United States raises more revenue from her tariff system than any nation in the world. Free Trade is unrestricted commerce. A tariff for revenue conflicts with the fundamental principles of Free Trade as much as a tariff for Protection.

At the Farmers' National Congress, held at the City of Washington on the 11th of January, 1887, Col. Beverly, of Virginia, the president of the body, in his address delivered at the opening, uses this language:

“The tremendous power of associated capital seeks to wrest from us (the farmers) an undue share of the fruits of our toil, under the delusive pretext of indirect taxation. \* \* \* Taxed as a class, directly or indirectly, out of all proportion to our equitable share of the necessary public expenses,” etc.

The charge intended to be made by the president is, that the provisions of the Protective Tariff which we now have are such that the

farmers of our country are taxed directly or indirectly out of all proportion to what they ought to pay toward defraying the necessary expenses of the government; that they, in consequence, are deprived of more than their share of the fruits of their toil; and that this is done for the benefit of the manufacturing interest. These in substance are the charges which the president of the congress makes.

They are either true or untrue. If true, and the farmers of our country as a class are being unduly taxed, and are paying more than their just share for the benefit of the manufacturers or anybody else, all will agree that it is a wrong, and one which ought to be corrected, and at once, by proper legislation.

If, on the other hand, the charges are untrue their untruthfulness should be shown, for the tendency of such charges is to array class against class, and one industry against another, and in this way do a great injury. All the classes and all the different industries of the country should work in harmony with each other. All the people, property, and industries should be equally taxed and equally protected in their rights and privileges. The incendiary only destroys one or more buildings which can be replaced by money; but the man who sows the seed of discord and controversy among the people does a wrong the injury of which it is difficult sometimes to compute, and the effects of which may last for generations.

Let us see whether the charges are true or untrue. There are persons known as Free Traders, both in this country and in England, who advocate the adoption of the English system of a tariff for revenue only, in place of the American system of Protection. These people pretend that a Protective Tariff works an injury to the farmer, and they assert that if we will repeal our Protective system and permit England and other European countries to bring their manufactured commodities into the country free of duty, our farmers and the people generally will be benefited; that they then would be enabled to buy all their manufactured commodities much cheaper than they can now buy them, and that the difference between what they are now paying for these commodities and that which they would have to pay, if we were to repeal our Protective Tariff, marks the amount which is wrongly taken from them, and which they call unjust taxation for the benefit of the manufacturer. They contend that to this extent the farmer is wronged, and has his property unjustly taken from him without any corresponding benefit or advantage. Among those who hold these views is the Hon. Frank Hurd, of Ohio. In his address before the Board of Agriculture of New Jersey, on 27th of January last, he is reported to have said:



“The whole basis and foundation of a Protective Tariff is an increase of price on articles of consumption.” This is untrue in theory, and still more untrue in practice. It is astonishing that any intelligent man who knows anything about the question should assert this, and all the more so when it has not only been denied but its untruthfulness shown over and again. A Protective Tariff is never levied to increase the price on articles of consumption.

Under our Protective Tariff we admit coffee, tea, spices, etc., free of duty. Mr. Hurd, under his English tariff for revenue only, which he advocated so strongly, most likely would impose a duty on tea, coffee, and spices. Not producing these in this country the tariff would most likely enhance the price to the extent of the duty levied; but such a tariff would be one for Revenue only and not a Protective Tariff in any sense.

The manufacturing of steel rails in this country commenced in 1867. England was charging us then for steel rails over \$150 per ton. In 1872 they were selling for \$112 per ton. About this time there was imposed a duty of \$28 per ton. In 1874, two years after this, they were selling for \$94.25 per ton. In 1876, two years later, they were selling for \$59.25, and in 1885 they sold down as low as \$27 per ton.

Previous to 1860 the tariff on earthenware was twenty-four per cent. The pottery industry at this time was substantially unknown, and England supplied the United States with nearly all the pottery commodities which we used.

She had no competition, and fixed her own prices, and the people of this country had to pay them. The Protective Tariff raised the duty to forty per cent., and since then it has been still further increased to fifty-five per cent. Under these duties the industry has sprung into existence, and grown to an extent so that our home manufactures are now making one-half of all the crockery used in the country; and the home competition has forced down the price in England as well as in this country, so that now you can buy as much for two dollars and fifty cents as you could in 1860 for four dollars, and many descriptions are actually cheaper, and selling here in the United States for a less price than they are being sold in England.

Whilst residing at Liverpool I ordered a watch of one of the makers in that city: he charged me forty guineas, or \$200 in our money. After I came home I gave this watch to my son, and bought one made in the United States, for which I paid \$100, that I now carry, a far better time-piece, and more satisfactory in every way. The duty then and now is twenty-five per cent. on watches,

and, as we shall hereafter see, we are exporting our watches and clocks to England.

By our present Protective Tariff on the lowest grades of unbleached cotton cloths there is a duty of two and one-half cents per square yard, on bleached three and one-half cents, and on colored prints four and one-half cents, with a corresponding higher rate on the higher grades of cotton goods. Will Mr. Hurd, or any one else, pretend that these duties have increased the price, or in any way added one cent to the cost, of cotton goods in the United States?

The manufacturers in this country are selling some of these goods made here at a price as low as the duty which is imposed by the law upon them; and, as we shall hereafter see, we are exporting our cotton goods to England, and selling them in the markets there in open competition with the English manufactures. In none of these cases has the duty increased the price; so far from this, it has not only put it down, but forced the English manufacturer to reduce his price, which he would never have done so long as he had the monopoly of our market and could fix his own price for his commodities. It was not until home competition came in and forced him that he put down his prices.

These examples, showing the untruthfulness of Mr. Hurd's statements, might be multiplied, but possibly enough have been given to satisfy any reasonable man.

The first of our present Protective laws was passed in 1861. Modifications and changes of these laws have from time to time been made since, but the American Protective system may be said to have then been inaugurated.

Before this period we had what has been regarded as Free Trade, or, more properly, the English system, a tariff for revenue only.

In answering these gentlemen, and others holding the same views, let me call your attention to this fact—that there is not a single manufactured commodity, so far as I know, but what is cheaper to-day in the United States, under our Protective system, than it was in 1860, under Free Trade, and before the Protective Tariff went into operation. Crockeryware is 37 per cent. cheaper than it was in 1860; cotton goods are at least 20 per cent. less; and woolen goods, including dress goods and carpets, from 20 to 25 per cent. less. Silk goods, taking them on an average, are from 35 to 40 per cent. cheaper in price than they were in 1860, and so with all other kinds of textile goods, iron and steel commodities, including machinery, edge tools, ironware, farming implements, tools, household goods, furniture, etc.

We have already seen the decline in steel rails, and that they

have been sold within the last two years as low as \$27 per ton—a reduction from \$150, under our Protective system, to \$27! No one will pretend that the farmers have been injured by these reductions in the price of manufactured commodities. Everything of these that they buy can be purchased to-day cheaper than they could in 1860, before we had the Protective Tariff. What has caused this decline in prices?

Why is it that since we adopted our Protective system the prices of all manufactured commodities in this country have gone down and are cheaper than they were under Free Trade? The answer is, domestic competition and machinery, with the inventive genius and versatility of character of our people, have caused it; it is the natural outgrowth of the American system—just what you might expect from such a nation and such a people as we have. Give them proper protection and they will outstrip the world in production.

But this is not all the Protective Tariff has done. The contention of the Free Traders is, that if you abolish it our farmers could buy of the English their manufactured commodities cheaper than they can now buy them. All we have to do in order to relieve the farmer, so they say, is to introduce Free Trade and permit all foreigners to bring their manufactured goods into the United States free of duty and take the place of those that we are now manufacturing.

Let us look just at one thing that must follow if this is done. All imported goods into our country, under the present tariff, except those on the free list, now pay duty, and this duty takes the place of tax, and goes toward defraying the expenses of the government. Nearly all the expenses of our government are paid in this way, and the people, including the farmer, are relieved to this extent from direct tax. When you repeal the tariff and introduce Free Trade your revenue will cease, and you will have to provide some other mode to procure the money necessary to pay these expenses. There is but one way left, and that is by direct taxation in some form or other levied directly on the farmer, mechanic, and others. There is no escape from this.

The foreign manufacturer who brings his goods here now has to pay duty, and in this way, as we have seen, most of the Federal taxes are paid. Repeal the tariff and you then permit him to bring his commodities into the country and sell them without paying one cent of our taxes, and you shift the whole burden of their payment upon our own people—our manufacturers, farmers, and mechanics.

Taxes must be paid in some way or other, either by duties on imports, or else by direct taxation. They are now divided. The for-

eign manufacturer who brings his commodities here to sell has to pay his proportion of these taxes. Under Free Trade the foreigner would be entirely exempt, and the whole would be imposed upon our own people.

But let us pursue this question further, and see whether the farmers are being injured. Upon investigation it will be found that nine-tenths of the manufactured commodities used by the farmers of our country, including clothing, household goods, furniture, and implements of husbandry, tools, etc., are as cheap in price in this country as they are now selling for in England, and in some instances even cheaper. During the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1886, we exported from this country 193,841,353 yards of cotton goods, enough to wrap around the earth at the equator four times and halfway around it again. Of this quantity we sent 11,957,842 yards to Great Britain. We also exported \$435,536 worth of cotton wearing apparel, and \$1,144,137 worth of other manufactured cotton goods; much of both of these two last named went to England. When I was in England, over two years ago, I saw at the leading dry goods stores our cotton goods for sale, better in quality and cheaper in price than those manufactured in England. Now let any American farmer reflect for one moment on the extent of the use of cotton goods in his house: all the underclothing of himself and the members of his family, and often the dresses in calico his wife and children wear; the sheets in which he sleeps, the ticking on the bed, and, it may be, the table cloths on his table, as well as the towels and napkins he uses, and the curtains at the windows.

We exported \$773,878 worth of glassware, some of which went to England.

Now it is pressed glass that we find on the tables of our farmers, as well as most of the other people. That which is made in this country is better in quality and just as cheap in price as that which is made in England. We also exported \$163,908 worth of crockeryware. We have already seen the great reduction there has been in the price of this ware. Our farmers generally use what is known as the whiteware for their tables. The whiteware made at Trenton, New Jersey, is just as good and cheaper in price than that which is made and sold in England.

Most farmers in this country have clocks and watches. We exported last year \$1,110,273 worth of clocks and \$255,887 worth of watches. Of these, \$167,714 worth of the watches and \$480,296 worth of the clocks went to England.

There is no country that makes better and cheaper time-pieces than those made in the United States. Our Yankee clocks, as they

are called, are in use all over England, and exposed for sale in almost every clock store in the kingdom, better in quality and cheaper in price than any made there. We exported \$111,715 worth of cutlery. Our cutlery is equal to any made in England in quality, and as cheap in price. We exported \$1,181,056 worth of saws, edge tools, etc.; of this to Great Britain, \$162,643. Our edge tools, axes, etc., are found in most all the hardware stores of England, and superior in quality and cheaper in price than those made there. We exported \$1,285,285 worth of locks, hinges, and hardware, including \$187,112 worth to England. We exported \$3,685,220 worth of machinery; of this, \$636,138 worth went to England. We exported 554,365 pairs of boots and shoes, some of which went to England. The farmer can buy his boots and shoes in this country as cheap as he can in England. We exported \$2,121,812 worth of household furniture, and \$331,235 worth of woodenware; over \$213,000 worth of the former and over \$124,000 worth of the latter went to England. Furniture and woodenware of all kinds, from the wooden bedstead down to a clothes pin, except where hand-carved, are cheaper in this country than in England. We exported \$466,156 worth of woolen wearing apparel; of this, over \$71,000 worth went to England. We exported \$664,304 worth of rubber and gutta-percha goods, including 8720 pairs of boots and shoes, to England. Our export of carriages and horse cars was \$1,340,198 worth, and of agricultural implements, including reapers, mowers, plows, etc., \$2,360,021 worth, much of which went to England. All of our agricultural implements and tools, as a rule, are better in quality and cheaper in price than those made in England, and this will apply as well to wagons, carts, barrows, etc. We also exported \$1,778,660 worth of fire-arms; over 10,300,000 pounds of nails and spikes; \$196,208 worth of stoves; \$546,022 worth of lamps, etc.; over 18,600,000 pounds of soap; over 8,000,000 pounds of wire; and \$1,314,639 worth of books, maps, etc. Paper in this country at the present time is cheaper than in England. As a rule, commodities are not exported unless they are selling for less in the country from which they are exported than they are in the country into which they are taken. The object of exporting is to obtain better prices than can be obtained at home. And this will apply to our exports to other countries of manufactured commodities during the past year.

Something over two years ago I attended the national agricultural exhibition of France. It was held in Paris, and a grand exhibition it was—quite worthy of the great nation it represented.

There were fourteen or fifteen acres of ground covered with

farming implements, tools, machinery, etc. I spent four days at it. All the exhibitors had their price-lists upon their exhibits. I was careful to obtain their list of prices. The lowest-priced horse-rake was 250 francs, or fifty dollars of our money. You can buy just as good a one in any town in the United States for twenty-seven dollars. The lowest-priced mower was \$102 in our money, and no better if as good as we sell for sixty dollars. The lowest-priced reaper, without the binder, was \$185; no better than ours for \$110. The plows, harrows, and cultivators were twenty per cent. more in price than they are selling for in the United States. There was not a hoe, fork, shovel, spade, or rake on the ground but what was dearer in price and inferior to ours in quality. I therefore repeat what I have before said, that under our Protective Tariff the prices of all manufactured commodities, instead of being enhanced, have actually been reduced; and that nine-tenths of all manufactured commodities now used by our farmers in the United States are as cheap, and in many instances cheaper, than they are in England. This being so, what becomes of the argument of Frank Hurd and other Free Traders, that our farmers are being overtaxed and injured by our tariff; that they are paying more than their proper share or proportion of the expenses of government by reason of the Protective Tariff? There is not a word of truth in the assertions, or a single fact upon which the charges can be truthfully based.

The statistics of the country, as well as the prosperity of our people, give a crushing denial to all these charges and assertions.

Now how much better off would the farmers of our country be if our tariff was repealed, and they were compelled to go to England to buy what they require, when many of these commodities of the same quality are dearer in price there than they are in the United States? You must remember the assertions of the Free Traders are that what they have to buy is cheaper in England, and the object in repealing our laws is to enable the farmers to buy there. Is it likely that these people over there, after we repealed our tariff laws, and were wholly dependent upon them, as we then should be for what we require, would be willing to sell to us cheaper than they do now? According to all the laws of trade, as you increase the demand, the prices go up. Would it not be so in this case? All you buy here would then be bought there, and the quantity would be doubled, if not quadrupled, and the price would go up accordingly and in the same proportion, and our farmers would have to pay it. This would follow just as certain as the night follows the day, and they would find to their cost that the Englishman is quite as selfish and willing to make money as any of our own peo-

ple. But suppose they were to agree not to put up the price, and continue to sell to us at the same prices they are now selling, our farmers would in many instances have to pay more than they are now paying here at home, and would have, in addition, to pay the costs and expenses of transportation across the ocean, with the commission of the middle-men.

But some will answer, if we can compete with England in manufactured goods why do we want a Protective Tariff? My reply is, that we are not now discussing the needs of a Protective Tariff, but whether the farmer is being injured and robbed by ours; whether he is compelled, in consequence of this tariff, to pay more than his proper and just share of the expenses to support the government. This is the question we are considering. But to satisfy those who are so anxious to have Free Trade, and so anxious to introduce English goods into our country to take the place of those we are manufacturing here, I will answer the question. First, we want Protection in the cases where we can compete so as to keep the manufacturing industry of all these commodities here in our own country in order to give our laboring people the benefit of making them. We want our own people to be employed so they can receive the wages. We think it more important that these wages should be paid to our own people than that they should be paid to the English people. We manufacture in the United States, one year with another, about \$7,000,000,000 worth of commodities, and pay the laboring people each year who are directly employed in making them about \$1,500,000,000. Now if these goods are made in England these wages would be paid to the English work people there, and not to our people. It is just a question whether they shall be paid here at home to our own people, or whether they shall be paid to the work people over there.

But there is another reason why we require Protection where we are competing: we do not want our country to be made the dumping-ground for the overproduction of Europe. The overproduction in Europe is of frequent occurrence, and arises sometimes in this way: Three men, or more, if you please, are manufacturing fancy woolen goods or any other goods; one may be at Preston, one at Manchester, and another at Leeds, in England. Neither knows what the other is doing. They have to manufacture in advance and upon their own judgment as to style and the demands of the market. For instance, for winter goods they begin to manufacture the spring before.

These men, and possibly others, not knowing what each other are doing or intend to do, in the exercise of their wits, as to the class

and style of goods which are likely to be salable in the market the coming autumn or winter, all hit upon the same class or style, and when the season opens for placing them on the market find they have more than the market requires.

There is overproduction, and they must submit to a loss, and the question with them is the extent of the loss, and what is best to be done. They very naturally come to the conclusion not to break down their own market, and resolve to keep up the price at home and realize the profits there as far as they can, and send the surplus to the United States and throw it upon our market at whatever price it may sell, and in this way to unsettle and break it down, and bring ruin upon our manufacturing and business men, in the hope that they may profit by it in the future.

Whilst I was consul at Liverpool I invoiced hundreds of invoices to the amount of millions of dollars at about half the price it cost to make the goods in England. This was done in consequence of overproduction, and the goods in most instances were sent to break down our markets.

All of our business men suffer from this, and none more than the industrial and laboring class, including those engaged in farming, as well as others.

We therefore require a Protective Tariff, even where we are competing with Europe in producing, to protect labor and develop our own resources.

It having been shown that the farmers are not overtaxed or injured by Protection, and that the charges to that effect are entirely untrue, and destitute of facts to sustain them, let us now go further and see what benefits, if any, they derive from it; in other words, how the Protective Tariff affects them. In 1880, as appears by the census, there were but 17,312,099 persons who worked and earned wages in the United States out of a population of over 50,000,000. This would leave over 32,600,000 persons who did not labor or earn wages. Of those who worked and earned wages there were 7,670,493 employed in agriculture, 4,000,000 in professions, a fraction less than 4,000,000 in manufacturing, etc., and 1,800,000 in trade and transportation. It will be observed here that the whole number engaged in agriculture is 7,670,493, and not one-half of our population, as Frank Hurd and other Free Traders are in the habit of stating when addressing the farmers, or even half who earn wages. Our population to-day is computed to be not less than 60,000,000; and the number who work and earn wages in all the different branches of industry and trade are probably increased in the same proportion as the population has been increased—more farmers,



more manufacturers, more professional men, and more people employed in trade. These people who work, as well as those who do not work, are all fed by the farmer, and constitute what is called the home market.

Those who do not work are, as a rule, supported and fed from the wages earned by those who do work. Now the agricultural products of the United States, outside of cotton, tobacco, and the fruits and vegetables that are consumed in our cities and towns, amount, one year with another, to over \$3,000,000,000. Any reflective man must know that there necessarily are millions of tons of sweet potatoes, tomatoes, onions, beets, carrots, green peas, beans, apples, pears, plums, peaches, strawberries, raspberries, and blackberries carried into our cities and towns and consumed by our people that can not be well computed or the value stated, which generally are not included when we speak of our products.

Now of these agricultural products, leaving out cotton and tobacco, at least ninety-two per cent. are consumed here at home by our own people, and less than eight per cent. are exported. The statistics of the country show these facts. The home market takes at least ninety-two per cent., and the foreign market less than eight per cent. You can thus see the importance of the home market and the comparative insignificance of the foreign market to our farmers in the consumption of their products. And it may be mentioned just here that the home market is near our doors and always certain, while the foreign market is distant, uncertain, and capricious—dependent upon the harvest abroad, whether good or bad, and is always open to the competition of other nations. Now the power to buy depends upon what one receives. The wages the laboring man earns limits his capacity to purchase, and this applies as well to the purchase of agricultural products as to other merchandise. The wages received always depend upon his employment. If he is employed he earns wages; if he has no employment he earns no wages. The question of the home market, whether good or bad, then turns upon our people being employed.

If they are all employed, or all those who are able to work, then the home market is good, for the people can buy; if, on the other hand, they are not all employed, then the home market is poor, to the extent that our people are not employed. That brings us directly to another question—the diversity of industrial pursuits in order to give employment to our people.

It may be stated in this way: The power to buy agricultural products, as well as other commodities, depends upon the wages our people earn, and the amount of wages they earn upon their employ-

ment, and the employment upon the extent and number of our industrial pursuits. The more numerous and general our industrial pursuits the more people there will be employed, the more wages earned, and the better the home market will be for the farmer. If Protection, then, tends to contribute to the increase of industrial pursuits,—and no one can deny but what it does,—then the farmer is not injured, but directly benefited by it. No class of people in the country are more benefited than they are. This always has been and always will be the case. No civilized nation ever has been or ever will be prosperous and great without diversified industries. Labor produces wealth, and wealth gives power. The manufacturing industries of the country to-day employ not less than 5,000,000 people, to whom \$1,500,000,000 in wages are paid, and they produce about \$7,000,000,000 worth of manufactured commodities annually. These people and all those who are dependent upon them are fed by the farmer, and constitute, as we have seen, a part of his home market. The wages they earn in the mill and workshop enable them to buy the products of the farmer.

Close up the mill and workshop, and they cease to earn wages, and their power to buy is gone. The Protective Tariff has built thousands of mills and added millions of dollars of capital to our industrial pursuits, so that our manufactured commodities have run up from \$1,800,000,000, in 1860, to \$7,000,000,000 at this time.

Among the numerous industries which have been built up and promoted by our Protective system since its adoption in 1861 there are three that stand out most prominently as creatures entirely of Protection: the crockery, the steel-rail, and the silk industries. Before the adoption of the Protective system, in 1861, crockery and silk industries in this country only existed in name, and were of no account commercially; and steel rails were not even manufactured in the United States. They are now all-important. The silk industry to-day employs more than 40,000 persons and manufactures upwards of \$50,000,000 worth of commodities—more than one-half of the whole consumption of the country. During the past year we manufactured over 1,500,000 gross tons of steel rails, to the value of not less than \$52,000,000, and gave employment to thousands of our people. This is more than England or any other country has made. We imported less than 42,000 tons, therefore substantially manufacturing our whole consumption. In crockeryware we manufactured during the year over \$6,000,000 worth of ware—considerable more than one-half of the whole consumption of the country, and giving employment to thousands of our people. These three industries owe their existence entirely to our Protective system.

Without Protection we should never have had any one of them. It was Protection that brought them into existence and gave them life, and that has sustained them since. They have given employment to thousands of our people, a market for our farmers, and greatly reduced the price of all these commodities to the consumers.

Of the manufactured commodities used by our people about ninety-two per cent. are manufactured at home, and less than eight per cent. imported. But the Free Trader says you can buy these commodities cheaper in England than you can in the United States; that the Protective Tariff prevents the farmers of this country from getting the advantage of buying in England, and they therefore propose to repeal our Protective Tariff and substitute the English system—one for revenue only—in its place, to enable the farmers to buy their manufactured commodities in England to take the place of those which are now made in the United States. In the language of Mr. Beverly and Mr. Hurd, this will relieve them of the unjust taxation to which they are subjected. All their arguments lead directly up to this. Suppose we accede to their demands and repeal our Protective Tariff, what would follow?

The commodities we now manufacture would be manufactured in England, and the wages we now pay to our own people in the United States would be paid to the work people in England, and the profits on the manufactured products would also be paid to the English manufacturer; in a word, our mills and workshops would be closed and our people thrown out of employment. Our work people would lose their wages and the English people would gain them. A practical example will show how this would work, and how the farmer is benefited by Protection. We will take the silk industry of New Jersey. We made last year, in New Jersey, \$28,320,400 worth of silk goods on a capital invested of \$11,500,000, and employed in this industry over twenty thousand work people, to whom were paid over \$6,700,000 in wages. These twenty thousand people employed in this business, some in Paterson, some in Passaic, some in Hoboken, some in Newark, and some in other localities, received this amount of wages. Many, indeed most of these persons, have others dependent upon them. Men have families and girls have parents who live from the wages earned in the mills. If you assume that each of these persons has two dependent upon him or her, and who thus live from the wages earned, it will make sixty thousand people who are directly living from this one industry.

Now suppose all these people should be gathered together in one town, they would make a large city of themselves. But when you put them together in a town you create the necessity for other per-

sons living with them. They would want churches for religious worship, and clergymen to preach; schoolhouses, and teachers to instruct their children; carpenters, masons, plasterers, and painters to build and keep the houses in repair; cabinetmakers to manufacture furniture; shoemakers, tailors, and hatters to make clothing; wheelwrights, blacksmiths, and carriage and harness makers; storekeepers, butchers, and bakers, to feed the people and supply the necessaries of life; doctors and lawyers, hackmen and day laborers. You would have banks and insurance offices. Nor is this all. There must be some kind of government, and men to carry it on. Your police, fire, light, water, and tax departments would require many men. With all these and those dependent upon them you would swell your city to not less than one hundred thousand people, all of whom, directly or indirectly, would be dependent upon this one industry; and all of whom, every man, woman, and child, whether working in the mill, attending school, engaged in building houses, making clothes, baking bread, tending the stores, ministering to the sick, or performing police duty, would be fed by the farmer. Now although not all gathered in one city, so far as New Jersey is concerned, this one industry of silk manufacturing in the State gives employment to and supports, directly or indirectly, this number of persons scattered up and down in different locations. And the farmer feeds them. And so with every other manufacturing industry, not only in the State of New Jersey, but in the whole United States, whether in cotton, iron, steel, wool, paper, or anything else, the farmer not only feeds them and all those dependent upon them, but all the other persons who live off of them, whether as lawyers, doctors, teachers, storekeepers, butchers, bakers, tailors, dressmakers, carters, or mechanics. Now if the Morrison bill had passed, reducing the duty twenty per cent. on silk goods, every one of these silk manufactories would have stopped, and the twenty thousand people employed would have been thrown out of work, and those directly or indirectly dependent upon them would have lost their living. And this is not all that would have followed. The manufacturer would have lost his capital invested in the business. Who would have been benefited by this? Not the laboring man, for he would lose his employment; not the women and children dependent upon him, for they would lose their support; not the farmer, for he would lose his home market. He feeds the whole of these people now, but when they would lose their wages they could no longer buy. It is the money earned in the mills and workshops with which they buy, and when the wages stop they cease to purchase. Who then would be benefited? Not our people but the peo-

ple of England, France, and Belgium. The silk goods we are now manufacturing here would be manufactured there, and the wages and profits now earned by our people in the manufacture of these goods would be earned there, and paid to the people in those countries.

But this is not all. The twenty thousand people who would have their wages thus taken from them and thrown out of employment can not starve. Some, no doubt, would become paupers and a charge upon the counties in which they live; but most of them would make an effort to earn their bread to keep up life. What would they do? The most natural thing for them to turn to, and probably the only thing for which they would be fitted outside of their own trades, would be agriculture; for even if suited for any other industry, a tariff for revenue only would paralyze and injure to a greater or less extent every other manufacturing industry in the country, and persons employed in these, as well as the silk industry, would be turned out of employment and have their wages stopped.

In this way the repeal of the Protective system would destroy the home market.

The object avowed by Frank Hurd, and others of his school, is to enable the farmers to buy in England what they now consume of manufactured commodities. If this should be done to the extent that they bought in England our manufactories could not sell and would have to stop, and the business and the wages paid, as we have seen, would cease here and be transferred to England.

Suppose that one-fourth of the people now engaged in manufacturing should in this way be thrown out of employment in the mills and factories, it would be over one million two hundred thousand persons.

Now if one million of these should go into agriculture,—and the chances are that a much larger number would be thrown out of the manufacturing industries, and more than a million go into agricultural pursuits,—what would be the effect upon the production of agriculture? It would add not less than thirteen per cent. to the production; supposing these products, outside of tobacco and cotton, now to be \$3,000,000,000, they would be increased \$390,000,000; that is, our surplus of agricultural produce would be just \$390,000,000 more than they now are. The whole of our exports of agricultural products last year, including wine, lard, cheese, butter, linseed oil, canned goods, etc., partly manufactured, was \$484,954,595. Of this, cotton and tobacco amounted to \$232,244,099. Deducting cotton and tobacco, there would remain only \$252,710,496 of agricul-

tural products exported, including wine, canned goods, lard, cheese, butter, linseed and cotton-seed oil, and flour, all partly manufactured commodities. You would thus increase your agricultural products, outside of tobacco and cotton, \$390,000,000, which would be \$130,000,000 more than what you are now exporting. But this is not all. There would not only be an increase in the products, but there would be a falling off in the present home market to the extent of those persons who would be taken from the manufacturing industry and transferred to agricultural pursuits. Taking these at one million the decrease in the home market would be over six per cent. This would amount to \$180,000,000, outside of tobacco and cotton. This added to the \$390,000,000 would make our surplus agricultural products \$570,000,000 more than they are now, making the total surplus we should then have, \$822,710,000.

What are we to do with this surplus? We can not or have not been able to sell our present surplus during the past year at a profit to our farmers. What could we do with it when it is increased \$570,000,000? Let us see what proportion of this surplus would naturally fall on our wheat crop. The average yearly crop is about 450,000,000 of bushels. The surplus would be increased 85,000,000 of bushels. We only exported last year a fraction over 53,000,000 of bushels, and much of this exported was sold at a price so low that in some instances it scarcely paid the western farmer his expenses in raising it. We should add 85,000,000 of bushels to that which we exported last year. The great increase in production of wheat of itself would have the effect to put down the price, not only of wheat, but of all agricultural products. This most certainly would follow. Who would be benefited? The farmer? No; for he could not raise a single bushel more on an acre of land than he does now, and he would have to sell it for less. He would lose, and the laboring people of the country would lose; for all the industries of the country would be injured and crippled, many of them probably entirely destroyed. England would be benefited. She can not and does not raise sufficient food to feed her own people; more than one-half of all her breadstuffs are imported. She paid for agricultural products to feed her people, outside of tea, coffee, sugar, and spices, and fruits, over \$500,000,000 last year, and this amount is increasing from year to year. England would, therefore, be benefited, for she would be able to buy all of these products at a much less price than she is now paying.

Our farmers would lose, and the English people would gain—gain in the decrease of price they would have to pay for their food, and gain in the increase of their sales of their manufactured com-

modities that our people would then buy, to take the place of these which they now purchase of our own manufacturers.

The gain to England would be double, with a corresponding double loss to ourselves.

The farmer who owns a hundred acres of land could not then raise one single bushel more wheat than he does now. If his crop is now 400 bushels, it would not be more then; and if it is worth \$400 now, and the price goes down by the increased production and loss of home market one-fourth, as it most likely would do, if not much lower, his wheat would only be worth then \$300, and so with all the other crops the farmer raises. His profits would be one-fourth less, and he would have just this much less to support himself and family. And this would apply to every farmer in the country.

But there are those who will probably say that these additional farmers can send their increased surplus products abroad and sell them there.

The answer is, that we have now more surplus than we can sell at a profit, either at home or abroad. This is one of the complaints the farmers now make all over the country.

This condition of things will not be helped by the destruction of the home market which the farmer now has, and an increase in agricultural products.

But would the foreign market take more? It would not have to pay as much as it is now paying for what it buys, for as you increase production over consumption the price falls. Then, as now, the people abroad would take just what they require to feed their people, and no more.

It will be admitted that wheat is the great agricultural staple, and in all wheat-growing districts is mainly depended upon by the farmer. The wheat crop of the world is computed to be about 2,110,000,000 of bushels. Of this about 1,110,000,000 are grown in Europe, about 450,000,000 in the United States, and 287,000,000 in India, and the remainder in other parts of the world.

India and the United States raise more than can be consumed in their respective countries, and each has a surplus.

Eastern or Southeastern Europe also has a surplus, whilst there is a deficiency in Western Europe, which is the market not only for the surplus of wheat, but for the surplus of most of the other agricultural products which we produce.

The total deficiency of wheat in Europe, one year with another, is about 200,000,000 bushels. If they have a good harvest it is much less, and with a very bad harvest it may be something over.

Until within a few years the United States has been the country from which most of this deficiency in wheat and other agricultural products has been drawn. The next country that has supplied wheat to England has been Russia.

But our farmers now have a most formidable competitor in India. In 1879 India exported to Europe less than 2,000,000 bushels; last year they exported 39,312,969 bushels, and the United States only exported 53,025,938 bushels, for which our people only realized eighty-eight cents a bushel in England. The total crop of wheat in India last year was 287,000,000 of bushels, whilst ours in the United States was about 450,000,000. Our farmers are, therefore, brought face to face with open competition in India.

Where the production is more than the consumption loss must follow. We have seen that the deficiency in wheat is confined to Western Europe, and only amounts to about 200,000,000 bushels, taking one year with another. This deficiency has been met, until within the last few years, by Eastern Europe, mainly Russia and the United States. The surplus from Eastern or Southeastern Europe and the United States, without any increased production, is now quite enough to make up the entire deficiency of Western Europe, including England. Russia and the United States could of themselves, with a good harvest, almost if not quite do it. Australia is sending some wheat and other agricultural products to Europe; and now comes India and throws in last year upwards of 39,000,000 bushels. It is this additional quantity from India, added to the surplus which existed, that has made the overproduction, and from which the farmers are now suffering. It is this that has put down the price of wheat in this country, and the difference between what it was selling for before the India wheat was introduced and what it is now selling for on our total crop marks the loss the farmers of this country have sustained. This loss was not less than \$100,000,000 last year.

The lands in India are just as fertile and productive as ours. There are millions of acres that have never been cultivated, and by means of the extension of their railway system are fast being brought into cultivation. There are whole districts of country in India larger than all the New England States and New York together that have not a single mile of railroad in them, and no means of transportation to the seaboard except by ox-carts. Field labor in India can be had from six to eight cents per day, the hands feeding themselves out of these wages. As has been stated, it is this competition in wheat from India that has put down the prices during the past two or three years, and in some of the Western States almost below



the cost of production. Our farmers might as well understand that so long as they are dependent upon Europe as their only market for their surplus products they will never be able to realize the past prices for their wheat unless famine, pestilence, or war should intervene to temporarily put them up. No agricultural machinery, with the wages we are paying in this country, can compete with the labor of India at seven cents per day. The foreign markets, therefore, can not be depended upon to take our present surplus agricultural products, much less the increased surplus which would be created by the repeal of our Protective system and the adoption of the English system,—a tariff for revenue only,—with the large additions to agricultural pursuits and consequent large increase of products which would be sure to follow.

It is, therefore, no time to destroy or break down our home market. The question rather should be how to extend and increase it, for it is now our only certain reliance, and at no distant day may be our sole dependence. The only way to do this is to extend our industrial pursuits here at home to such an extent as to consume all our surplus agricultural products. This is the way to benefit the farmer. So long as we are dependent upon England for a market for our surplus products the English prices determine and regulate the prices in this country. When we consume all we produce the prices will be determined here at home by the supply and demand in our own market and not be affected by the prices in Europe.

We have seen that of the manufactured commodities consumed in this country only about eight per cent. are exported. With proper laws to induce our capitalists to manufacture these commodities which we now buy abroad, here at home, enough would be drawn from the other industries, mostly agricultural pursuits, to create a home market sufficient to consume all the surplus agricultural products we would then produce outside of tobacco and cotton. For by this the agricultural products would be decreased in quantity to the extent of the people drawn from agricultural pursuits, and the market for consumption would be increased to the same extent that they would engage in the new industries.

We have thus seen that the charges made against the Protective system, that the farmer is being unduly taxed and compelled to pay more than his just share of the burden of government, are untrue; that so far from this being the case, he is directly and indirectly protected and benefited by it in the home market it creates for the consumption of his surplus products.

With the view of prejudicing our farmers still more, many of the

Free Traders are asserting that the farmer is not protected by our present laws ; that it is only manufacturing industries that are protected. It is strange, in the face of the facts, that any one should assert it, but some of them do. Of course, this, like many of their other charges, is untrue. The farmers are directly protected by them. There is a duty of twenty per cent. imposed on live animals, except those for breeding purposes ; of one cent per pound on beef and pork ; of twenty per cent. on mutton ; two cents per pound on all hams, bacon, and lard ; of four cents per pound on butter and cheese ; of twenty cents a bushel on wheat ; ten cents per bushel on corn, rye, oats, and barley ; twenty cents per bushel on potatoes ; other vegetables, twenty cents ; hay, \$2.00 per ton ; hops, eight cents per pound ; vinegar, seven and a half cents per gallon ; honey, twenty cents per gallon ; tallow, one cent per pound ; and on tobacco from fifteen cents per pound for stems up to \$1.00 per pound for leaf stemmed ; and a duty on all his wool, rice, etc. This is as it should be ; the farmer should be in all things properly protected. I am sorry to have to admit that, notwithstanding this Protective duty in favor of the farmer during the past year, there was imported into the country from Canada and the adjoining provinces \$7,900,000 worth of breadstuffs, and more than \$1,000,000 worth of hay, beside \$2,173,454 worth of eggs, and over \$16,700,000 worth of wool. But for this Protective duty which our farmers have the Canadians would be in our market supplying many of the New England States with their products, and the Indian farmer quite likely in the New York market with his wheat. Protection, therefore, is as necessary to our farmers as it is for our manufacturers, and each is directly protected under our present system.

But there are still other benefits to the people, including the farmers, resulting from the system of Protection. Under it, as has been seen, our manufactured products have run up to \$7,000,000,000 ; and whilst our consumption of manufactured commodities is larger than any other nation, and our people are consuming *per capita*, that is, man for man, nearly double what the people of any other nation or people are, ninety-two per cent. of all we are thus consuming is manufactured in the United States, and only about eight per cent. imported. Now the effect of this has been to keep the profits on these manufactured commodities that we make here in the United States ; the wages also for making them have been paid to our own people. These profits and these wages have been retained here at home instead of being paid to the English people, as they would if the goods had been manufactured there. The effect

of this has been to cause the balance of trade to be in our favor for the last eleven years without one single exception. For the eleven years it has amounted to the sum of \$1,588,796,312; that is, in the trade of our people with the people of other nations we have sold to them in our products and commodities, \$1,588,796,312 more than we bought from them. This has made money plenty and cheap; interest, in consequence, has gone down at least two per cent. Money can be borrowed two per cent. less than it could have been ten years ago; and the farmers and the business men of the country are reaping the benefit of this reduction—no class more so than the farmers. It would be a difficult task to compute all the benefits cheap money and the reduction of interest have had upon the country. It stimulates trade and business in every branch of industry, builds up the towns and cities, improves the country, erects mills, extends our railways, and develops the resources of the country in a hundred ways, and enables us better to compete with the world in the cheapening of the commodities which we produce. We are enabled to produce just this much cheaper, and the people get the benefit of it. Not only the people who borrow, but all the people who consume the products—the producer as well as the non-producer, for all mankind consume. The only exception is the capitalist who loans money; he loses, but the rest of mankind gain, by cheap money.

Mr. Hurd, in his recent speech at Trenton, in order to make out his case, stated that France and Germany had adopted retaliatory duties against the United States because of our Protective Tariff, and England, for the same reason, had sought India from which to buy her wheat.

The tariff of sixteen cents a bushel on wheat, which France imposes, is not confined to the United States, as Mr. Hurd would have you believe, but is a duty levied to protect the farmer, and applies to all countries as well as the United States. We have a duty of twenty cents per bushel on wheat to protect our farmers, and France has a duty of sixteen cents per bushel to protect her farmers. The assertion that it was imposed as a retaliative measure is denied by France, and is untrue in point of fact. As to the willingness of France and Germany to enter into reciprocity treaties with us, as he alleges, there is nothing as yet to justify such a conclusion, except the fertile imagination of Mr. Hurd.

France had such a treaty with England for some years, but she gave notice to terminate the treaty some two or three years ago, and has since then steadily refused to renew it, though urged by England to do so.

The restrictions against the introduction of our pork were entirely on sanitary grounds, and so stated by both France and Germany.

The German tariff is also one of Protection and not retaliatory, and has been so declared by Germany.

With regard to the purchase of wheat by England in India, and the whole doctrine of reciprocity, unfortunately for Mr. Hurd and other Free Traders who think as he does, England, as a government, has nothing to do with buying or selling wheat either in India or the United States, and never has had. She does not do it, and never has done it, but, like all other governments, leaves it entirely with her merchants. Her corn merchants attend to this, and buy their wheat just where they can purchase it the cheapest. If they can buy wheat in New York and have it laid down at Liverpool one cent a bushel lower than they can from India, they buy it in New York; but if, on the other hand, they can buy it one cent cheaper in India, they buy it there. It is price and quality entirely that control the contract, and not the tariff or balance of trade between one nation and another, or anything else. The proposition, "*If you do not buy of me, I will not buy of you,*" so often quoted by the Free Traders, is not known on 'change, and has no value or consideration commercially; the only question is, where I can buy cheapest and make the most money out of the transaction. Every merchant goes into business to make money, and all his dealings and contracts are entered into with that object in view. And this applies to the German, French, and American merchants as well as the English. And their contracts are not trade or barter,—that is, one commodity given or exchanged for another commodity,—but a sale or contract for so much money, whether they are dealing with their own people or the people of another country, and this whether the contract is for iron, wheat, or textile goods. Hence the fanciful supposed story of Mr. Hurd, of a farmer taking his wheat to Liverpool and trading it for cloth, never occurred, and never will occur. It has no other existence except in Mr. Hurd's brain. The men there, as here, who deal in grain do not deal in textile goods or iron. If attempted practically it would be regarded as more ridiculous than it would be for a farmer to load fifty bushels of wheat on his cart and drive to John Wanamaker's store, and go in and tender it in payment for a silk dress. So long as our merchants can sell to the English merchant what he wants cheaper than he can purchase it elsewhere, so long will he continue to buy, whether it is agricultural products, cotton goods, clocks, or any other commodity. It is merely a question of price and quality and nothing else, and that without the least regard to reciprocity. This is the case with the merchants of

every civilized nation of the world. It always has been, and will continue so long as money is used as a symbol of value.

Commodities in the ordinary dealings between man and man, and one merchant with another, as a rule, are always sold for cash, and not bartered; and all their transactions, one with another, are entered into with the view of making money, and that without the least regard to national questions or reciprocal duties.

The statistics of our own country, and of every country in Europe, for the last hundred years will show this.

If it was not so, why is it that the United States, with its Protective Tariff, which Mr. Hurd thinks so offensive to England and other European nations, is the best customer that England has for her manufactured commodities; buys more, and has done this for the last five years without one single exception, than any other nation in the world. Our 60,000,000 of people, with a Protective Tariff, have taken more of her commodities than India, with her population of 253,000,000, with Free Trade; and more than the whole Russian Empire, with 98,000,000 of inhabitants. And this is not all. During the last ten years the trade of England with the United States has been larger than her trade with any other nation. There never was a greater fallacy attempted to be palmed off than that of reciprocity, as advocated by Mr. Hurd and other Free Traders to frighten our people. There is no truth in it, as a practical doctrine, and never has been, and nothing in the commerce of the world to prove it, when you examine the commercial statistics of the different nations. One word with regard to commercial reciprocity treaties between different nations. Two farmers may agree to tear down their fences and introduce the principles of Free Trade among their cattle. The one who has the largest herd, with the most voracious appetites, other things being equal, will make the most by it. If one's land should be fertile and productive, and the other's barren, they would not be very apt to agree to this arrangement. And so with nations. These treaties are always a dicker between two governments, each trying to get the advantage of the other. If one gains by it, which is apt to be the case, the other loses. They are very much like Free Trade principles—better to talk about than to practice.

So much for the benefits Protection has conferred upon the farmer. Let us now see what it has done for the people and the country generally. Have they been injured? We gaze, and there are no indications of decay, ruin, or injury. So far from this, prosperity and plenty abound on all sides; the green fields teem with the rich harvest; while the towns and cities are filled with busy men, engaged in

the trades, the mills, and the workshops ; and the hum of the spindle and the blows of the hammer are heard all around, as the great nation in its progressive march goes surging on.

The laboring people are receiving double the wages that are paid to the work people of any country in Europe, and this enables them to buy more and live better. In consequence they are better fed, better housed, better clothed and educated than the work people of any other country in the world ; have the means to buy, not only the necessaries of life, but many of the luxuries as well. They therefore consume double the quantity of manufactured commodities and double the quantity of agricultural products that any other people do. They thus become the best customers of the farmer as well as the manufacturer, and live on the earth as human beings made in God's image should live, as it was designed by the Creator that man should live.

Our Protective system commenced in 1861. In 1860 our population was 30,000,000 and a fraction over ; to-day I suppose it amounts to 60,000,000.

In 1860 we had about 30,000 miles of railways in operation. To-day we have 135,000 miles in operation, about as many miles as they have in the whole of Europe. In 1860 our manufactured commodities were \$1,800,000,000. To-day they amount to over \$7,000,000,000, about \$1,000,000,000 more than England or any other country in the world.

The material wealth of our country was computed in 1860 to amount to \$16,000,000,000, about \$10,000,000,000 less than that of England. It is computed now to be upwards of \$50,000,000,000, at least \$10,000,000 000 more than that of England. Our foreign commerce has doubled since 1860.

The working people of our country have \$1,100,000,000 in the saving institutions of the country. Our internal commerce amounts to \$10,000,000,000 a year, about as much as the foreign commerce of all the nations of Europe put together, and the total industries of the country are not less than \$11,000,000,000 a year.

During this period we had a civil war of four years' duration, which almost paralyzed every kind of business and industry, and spread ruin and desolation over a large portion of the country. Yet you may search history, either sacred or profane, modern or ancient, and you will not find one single example of a nation that has ever made the progress that we have during an equal period of time.

Our progress has been almost marvelous ; and to-day among the nations of the earth, in wealth, in power, in grandeur, and in civilization, the United States stands the first.







U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C055620256

