

Pamphlets on free Trade

HF

1713

P3

v. 3

MAIN



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

Number 14.



THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE,

23 WEST TWENTY-THIRD STREET, NEW YORK.



FARMERS AND THE TARIFF

A SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF THE FARMERS' CONGRESS, CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 11, 1887.

BY HON. THOMAS H. DUDLEY, OF NEW JERSEY,

Formerly United States Consul at Liverpool, England.

By the census of 1880 our population was 50,000,000 people. Of these only 17,392,099 earned wages, and the others, over 32,000,000, including the aged and the children as well as the sick, lived without earning wages. Most of those who did not earn wages doubtless lived off the wages earned by those who toiled. Of those who earned wages or lived by work there were 7,670,493 engaged in agricultural pursuits.

The population of the United States is probably now not less than 60,000,000. If the same ratio as to the employment of our people holds good there are now about 20,800,000 people who earn wages or live by work, including about 9,000,000 engaged in agricultural pursuits. There is no other single industry that gives employment to so many of our people. While the product of the agriculturists does not equal in value the product of the manufacturing industries of our country, agriculture is, to a certain extent, the basis and foundation of all other industries. No other industry can possibly exist without it. The farmer feeds all the people. The miner who goes down into the earth may dispense with a house and live in the hole he

has dug; the lady may dispense with the bonnet and depend upon the covering for the head which nature has given her; and the man who toils may dispense with shoes for his feet and wrap the raw hide about them; but none of them can dispense with the products of the farm; all must have bread or die. Agriculture should therefore be protected, and there is no country in the world where it stands more in need of protection than in the United States. It should be protected in the products it produces and in the market in which it sells its surplus products. The latter is quite as important as the former. If the farmer can not sell there is no incentive to produce more than enough for his own wants. And if he has no surplus, or can not sell what he has, he can not buy clothing to keep out the cold or the necessaries of life upon which he lives. It is the money from his surplus products that enables him to live.

OUR TARIFF PROTECTS THE FARMER'S PRODUCTS.

By the present tariff the farmer is directly protected. There is a duty of 20 per cent. imposed on live animals, except those for breeding purposes; of 1 cent per pound on beef and pork; of 20 per cent. on mutton; of 2 cents per pound on hams, bacon and lard; of 4 cents per pound on butter and cheese; of 20 cents per bushel on wheat; of 10 cents per bushel on corn, rye, oats and barley; of 15 cents per bushel on potatoes; of \$2 per ton on hay; of 8 cents per pound on hops; of 7½ cents per gallon on vinegar; of 20 cents per gallon on honey; of 1 cent per pound on tallow; of from 15 cents per pound for tobacco stems up to \$1 per pound for leaf stemmed; and a duty on all his wool, rice, orchard fruits, etc. This is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The duties imposed should be enough to keep out all foreign competition. This they do not do.

MORE PROTECTION NEEDED FOR AGRICULTURE.

I find in the last published reports of our imports and exports, that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, we imported articles of food and live animals, not including coffee, tea, sugar and molasses, amounting to over \$54,000,000, and that during the year ended June 30, 1887, this amount for food and live animals, not including coffee, tea, sugar and molasses, had increased to over \$57,000,000. The figures for 1886 include vegetables, \$2,552,179; provisions, meat, and dairy products, \$2,088,445; breadstuffs, \$7,935,476; animals paying duty, \$3,609,431; wool, \$16,746,081; 92,118 tons of hay, valued at \$1,035,533; 2,672,762 pounds of hops, valued at \$444,989; and 16,092,583 dozen of eggs, valued at \$2,173,454. India wheat can be laid down in London at 70 cents per bushel, and in New York at 75 cents, with-

out duty. With the duty added it can be put down at New York at 95 cents per bushel, and with the increased railway facilities which are now being introduced in India before five years the India farmer will be able to place his wheat in the New York market at a very much lower rate, probably as low as 60 cents per bushel without the duty, and, unless the present duty on wheat of 20 cents per bushel is increased, India wheat will be here in our markets competing with our farmers. This is no fancy sketch, but a sober truth which I fear our farmers will have to meet face to face too soon. The lands in India are as rich and fertile as our own. How is it possible for our farmers to compete with the Indian farmer in raising wheat when the latter can hire all the labor he requires at from 6 to 8 cents per day without board, the laborer feeding himself out of these wages? All the labor-saving machines we have and use do not and can not make up for this difference in the price of labor. In India you can hire 150 men for a day on the interest alone of the money you pay for your reaper here.

When we are paying over \$57,000,000 a year on the articles of food and live animals which we import into our country, it is time to increase and not diminish our tariff. The farmer requires more protection and not less. Why is it necessary to import into this country more than \$2,500,000 worth of vegetables, including cabbage from Holland, 317,156 bushels of potatoes from Scotland, 1,441,466 bushels of potatoes and 608,283 bushels of beans and peas from Canada, Nova Scotia, etc.? Why is it necessary to import over \$1,000,000 worth of hay, and nearly \$8,000,000 worth of breadstuffs, and over 16,000,000 dozen eggs, some of which come from Denmark, Norway and Sweden? With the farming industry, as with the manufacturing industry, our people have to contend with the cheap labor of other countries, and each of these great industries requires to be protected from this cheap labor. It has come to this: We must either lower our wages to the standard of European labor, which we cannot and never will consent to do, or else we must protect it. There is no intermediate course or halfway measure that will meet the difficulty. It is the wages we pay our people that marks the difference between the condition of our laboring people and those of Europe; that gives to the one many of the luxuries of life, while the other does not even have all the necessaries; enables the one to live, while the other almost starves.

THE FARMER'S HOME MARKET HIS BEST MARKET.

The farmer requires a market in which to sell his surplus products. He builds the house in which he lives and buys the clothes he wears, as well as his furniture and the implements he uses on his farm, out of his surplus

products. Hence his market should be secure ; in other words, he should be as far as possible protected in his home market.

The agricultural products of our country, outside of tobacco and cotton, amount to about \$3,000,000,000 per year. Of this quantity about 92 per cent. is consumed at home and only about 8 per cent. is exported. That is to say, the home market takes 92 per cent. and the foreign market takes only 8 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 surplus products. It may also be mentioned that 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 the means the purchaser can command. 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 commodities. The wages he receives 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 and the amount of wages they receive. If they, or all those who are able to work, are employed, then the home market is good, for the people can buy ; if, on the other hand, they are not employed, then the home market is poor, for they cannot buy. To the extent, then, that our people are employed is the home market good or bad. Therefore, in order to give our people employment there must be a diversity of industrial pursuits, and the more numerous these industrial pursuits are the more persons will be employed. No civilized nation ever has been or ever will be prosperous and great without diversified industries, and the more numerous the industries are the greater the prosperity of the nation will be.

PROSPEROUS MANUFACTURES MAKE PROSPEROUS FARMERS.

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 yearly paid, and they yearly produce about \$7,000,000,000 worth of manufactured and other commodities. These people, and all those dependent upon them, are fed by the farmer and mainly constitute his home market. The wages they earn in the mill and workshop, as we have seen, enable them to buy the surplus products of the farmer. Now, these commodities must be manufactured either here or in Europe. Some of our people seem to desire that they should be made in England, and all their efforts are in that direction, their aim being to take the work from our own people and give it to the working people of England. If these

goods are made here the wages for making them and the profits on the goods manufactured would be earned in our own country and paid to our own people; if, however, they are made in England, the wages would be paid there and the profits would be earned there, and the people in England, and not our people, would receive the benefit. The English people would be employed and would earn the wages we are now paying to our people, while our people would be idle. As we have seen, if the people do not earn wages they cannot buy, and the farmer's home market would be injured, if not destroyed. To show how this would operate let me give an example.

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 alone over 20,000 working people, to whom were paid over \$6,700,000 in wages. These 20,000 people employed in this business—some in Paterson, some in Passaic, some in Hoboken, some in Newark, and some in other localities—received these wages. Many, indeed most of these people, 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 others dependent upon him or her, and who thus live from the wages earned, it will make 60,000 people, all of whom are directly living from this one industry.

Now, if all these people were 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 persons living with them. They would want churches for religious worship and clergymen to preach; school-houses and teachers to instruct their children; carpenters, masons, plasterers, and painters to build and keep the houses in repair; cabinetmakers to manufacture furniture; shoemakers and hatters; tailors 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, etc. They would want banks and insurance offices. Nor is this all. Some kind of government would be required, and it would be necessary to have men to carry it on. The police, fire, light, water and tax departments would require many men. With all these people and those dependent upon them the number in this city would be increased to not less than 100,000 persons, all of whom, directly or indirectly, would be dependent upon this one industry, and of this number 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 con-

cerned, this one industry of silk manufacture in that State gives employment to and supports, directly or indirectly, fully 100,000 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, wool, paper, or anything else, the farmer not only feeds all those engaged, but all those who are dependent upon those engaged, and all the other persons who live indirectly off them, whether as lawyers, doctors, teachers, storekeepers, butchers, bakers, tailors, dressmakers, carters, or otherwise. Therefore, when you protect these industries you protect the farmer as well. Protection to one is protection to the other. The people engaged in these industries mainly constitute the farmer's home market, and, as we have already seen, it is the people who are employed by these industries that eat the surplus product of the farmer. If the people do not earn wages they cannot buy; the more wages they earn the greater is their prosperity and the more they can purchase.

DOES PROTECTION INCREASE THE PRICE OF PROTECTED GOODS?

But there are those who say that protection increases the price of the protected goods, and that the people have to pay the difference between the low price the goods would be if not protected, and the high price they bring when protected, and that the farmer and everybody else suffers to this extent, and they argue that the amount of protection placed upon a commodity represents the increased price to the purchaser. This is not true. The history of protection in our country shows directly the reverse of this. It shows that upon all commodities such as tea, coffee and spices, which we do not grow or produce in this country, the duty, when imposed, increases the price to the extent of the duty; but in no case has protection permanently increased the price upon commodities manufactured or produced here. The skill of our workmen, the machinery we use, and domestic competition have in every instance, as soon as the industry has been established, come in and reduced the price rather than increased it.

Let us look at the effect of protection upon the prices of articles manufactured in this country. An examination will show that there is not a single manufactured commodity, so far as I know, that is not cheaper to-day in the United States under our Protective system than it was in 1860 under Free Trade and before the present Protective tariff went into operation. Crockeryware is 37 per cent. cheaper than it was in 1860; cotton goods are at least 25 per cent. less; and woollen 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 than they were in 1860, and so are all

other kinds of textile goods. Iron and steel products, including machinery, edge tools, hardware, farming implements, tools, etc., and household goods, furniture, etc., are also much cheaper than they were in 1860.

Our present Protective system commenced in 1861. The manufacture of steel rails in this country began in 1867. England was charging us at that time for steel rails over \$150 per ton, and the duty imposed by us was 45 per cent. *ad valorem*. In 1871 the duty was changed from 45 per cent. *ad valorem* to a specific duty of \$28 per ton, and in 1872 steel rails were selling for \$112 per ton. In 1874, two years after this, steel rails were selling for \$94.25 per ton; in 1876, two years later, they were selling for \$59.25 per ton; and in 1885, nine years later, they sold as low as \$27 per ton.

Previous to 1860 the duty on earthenware was 24 per cent. The pottery industry in this country at that time was substantially unknown, and England supplied us with nearly all the pottery we used. England had at that time no competition, and fixed her own prices, and the people of this country had to pay them. The Protective tariff raised the duty to 40 per cent., and it has since been still further increased to 55 per cent. Under these duties this industry sprung into existence, and it has grown to such an extent that now our home manufacturers are making two-thirds of all the crockery used in the country. Our home competition has forced down the price in England as well as in this country, and now you can buy as much crockery here for \$2.50 as you could in 1860 for \$4, and many descriptions are actually cheaper and are selling here for a less price than they are sold for in England.

While residing in Liverpool I ordered a watch from one of the makers in that city, for which he charged me forty guineas, or \$200 in our money. After I came home I bought the watch I now carry in this country, for which I paid \$100. It is a far better watch than the one I bought in Liverpool and more satisfactory in every way. The duty at that time was and now is 25 per cent. on watches, and, as we shall hereafter see, we are now exporting watches and clocks to England.

By our present Protective tariff on the lowest grades of unbleached cotton cloths there is a duty of 2½ cents per square yard; on bleached, 3½ cents; and on colored prints, 4½ cents, with a corresponding higher rate on the higher grades of cotton goods. Will any one assert 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 of this class of goods in this country are selling some descriptions of their goods at prices 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 manufacturers. In none

of these cases has the duty increased the price; on the contrary, it has not only lowered the price, but it has also forced the English manufacturer to reduce his price as well, a step he would never have taken so long as he had the monopoly of our market and could fix his own price for his commodities. This reduction did not take place until our home competition came in and forced him to put down his prices.

WOULD THE DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURES HELP OUR FARMERS?

Notwithstanding all the reductions in the price of manufactured commodities which have taken place since the inauguration of the Protective system there are some persons who contend that manufactured commodities are still cheaper in England than they are here, and they go on to say that but for the Protective tariff our farmer could buy the same goods cheaper in England than he does here; and they demand the repeal of the Protective system and the substitution of the English system, a tariff for revenue only, to enable the English manufacturers to bring their commodities here free of duty and to sell them to our farmers, as they allege, at a cheaper rate than they are now paying. This, it is claimed, would be a great benefit to the farmer. Let us examine this question and see if it is true. Can the farmer buy in England cheaper than he can here, and, if he can, what would the effect of his buying there be upon our people and country, including the farmer and the persons engaged in other industries?

The first question that meets us is this: If we transfer the manufacture of all these commodities from this country to England we throw our people out of work, and we consequently injure our farmer's home market to this extent. We have seen that we now manufacture about \$7,000,000,000 worth of commodities, for which we pay not less than \$1,500,000,000 yearly in wages. It is the profit on these commodities and the wages we pay to labor that make business, stimulate trade, enrich our country, and enable our working people to live as they do, much better than the laboring people anywhere else in the world. Take away this work from our own people and give it to the people of England and what would be the consequence? The profits which our manufacturers now earn would be earned there; and the wages that our workpeople now earn would be earned by the workpeople there. These profits and these wages would then go to the people of England instead of to our own people. They would be heaped up there, and enrich that country instead of our own country. You would enrich them and impoverish us. If you do not pay wages to our people how can they buy from the farmer? To the extent that you take wages from our people and pay them to England to the same extent, as we have seen, do you injure

and destroy the farmer's home market. He would then have just as much surplus product as now; indeed, there would be more, for thousands who are now engaged in the mills and workshops would then be turned out, and would resort to agriculture to earn bread to keep themselves from starving. This would increase his surplus and make it more instead of less. What would the farmer then do with this surplus? If there is no money to buy it, he must let it rot or give it away. One thing would be certain; prices would go down and he would be compelled to sell at the reduced prices, at less than he is now receiving, and he would find himself with less money to purchase cheap commodities from England, even if they should be cheaper than he is now buying. The question would then be as it is now, how much will a bushel of corn or potatoes buy? A thing at half price is dear if you have no money to pay for it.

The next difficulty that meets us is this: All imported goods 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 our government. As has been stated, nearly all the expenses of the General Government are paid in this way; and the people, including the farmers, are relieved to this extent from direct taxation. When you repeal the tariff and introduce Free Trade your revenue will cease, and you will have to provide some other method of procuring 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 pays a duty upon them, and in this way helps to pay our taxes. Repeal the tariff and you then permit him to bring his commodities into this country and sell them without paying one cent of our taxes, and you shift the whole burden of the payment of these taxes upon our own people—our manufacturers, farmers and mechanics.

These are some of the reasons why we should not repeal our Protective system, even if we could buy all our manufactured commodities in England cheaper than we could in the United States. Even then, upon this assumption, the farmers of this country could not afford to do it. They would lose by it and not gain, and the loss in the home market alone would be far greater than any supposed gain abroad.

NEARLY ALL PRICES FOR MANUFACTURED GOODS AS LOW IN THIS COUNTRY AS IN EUROPE.

But what are the true facts of the case about the prices in England and the prices in the United States? It is time that some of the false assumptions and misstatements of free-trade writers should be corrected. Let us

inquire and see how far they are true and how far they are untrue. A residence of eleven years in England, and frequent visits there since my residence terminated, make me somewhat familiar with foreign dealings as well as prices, and I assert that 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, implements of husbandry, tools, etc., are as cheap in this country as they are in England, and in some instances even cheaper.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, we exported from this country 193,841,353 yards of cotton goods, and for the year ended June 30, 1887, 204,601,487 yards of the same goods, enough to wrap around the earth at the equator nearly five times. Of this quantity we sent, in 1886, 12,046,746 yards to Great Britain. We also exported \$435,536 worth of cotton wearing apparel and \$1,144,137 worth of other manufactured cotton goods, a large quantity of which went to England. I have seen our cotton goods for sale in England in the leading dry-goods stores there, and they were 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 calico dresses his wife and children wear, the sheets between which he sleeps, the ticking on his bed, and, it may be, the cloth on his table, as well as the towels and napkins he uses, and the curtains at the windows, are all manufactured from cotton, and the manufacture of these goods gives employment to thousands of American work-people, who, to a great extent, form the farmer's home market.

In 1886 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 made in this country is better in quality than that made in England, and just as cheap in price. In the same year we also exported \$163,908 worth of crockeryware. We have already noticed the great reduction that has taken place in the price of this ware. Our farmers generally use what is known as whiteware for their tables. The whiteware made at Trenton, New Jersey, is just as good and as cheap in price as that made and sold in England.

A majority of the farmers of this country have clocks and watches. We exported in 1886 \$1,110,273 worth of clocks and \$225,887 worth of watches. Of these \$167,714 worth of watches and \$451,135 worth of clocks went to England. There is no country that makes better and cheaper timepieces than the United States. Our Yankee clocks, as they are called, are in use all over England, and are exposed for sale in almost every clock store in the

United Kingdom. They are better in quality and cheaper in price than any made in that country. During the present summer I saw our American watches for sale in stores in London and Liverpool, as well as in Geneva, in Switzerland, the very centre of the watch manufacture of Europe.

We exported in 1886 \$111,715 worth of cutlery. Our cutlery is equal in quality to any made in England and is as cheap in price. In the same year we exported \$1,181,056 worth of saws, edge-tools, etc., of which \$162,643 worth went to Great Britain. Our edge-tools, axes, etc., are found in nearly all the hardware stores in England, and they are superior in quality and as cheap in price as 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 which \$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 going 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 which over \$71,000 worth went to England and Scotland. We exported \$664,304 worth of rubber and gutta-percha goods, including 8,720 pairs of boots and shoes to England. Our exports of carriages and horse-cars were valued at \$1,340,198, and our exports of agricultural implements, including reapers, mowers, plows, etc., were valued at \$2,360,021, 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. 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 all our exports of manufactured commodities to other countries.

Something over three 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. I spent four days at the Exhibition. There were fourteen or fifteen acres of ground covered with farming

implements, tools, machinery, etc. All the exhibitors had their price-lists upon their exhibits, and I was careful to obtain copies of them. The lowest priced horse-rake was 250 francs, or \$50 of our money. You can buy one just as good in any town in the United States for \$27. The lowest priced mower was \$102 in our money, and was no better than we sell for \$60, if as good. The lowest priced reaper, without the binder, was \$185; no better than ours for \$110. The plows, harrows and cultivators were 20 per cent. above the price that they are selling for in the United States. There was not a hoe, fork, shovel, spade or rake on the ground but was dearer in price and inferior in quality to ours.

I therefore repeat what I have said before, 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 and laboring people in the United States are as cheap as they are in England, and in many instances cheaper.

THE TARIFF ON CLOTHING.

Some of the woolen goods used in this country are dearer than they are in England. This is in consequence of the duty imposed on wool for the benefit of our farmers. As this duty is imposed for the farmer's benefit he should not complain.

While considering this question of woolens let us see to what extent it affects the laboring man, who has more right to complain, if there is any wrong, than the farmer. Take the amount of wages that any laboring man earns, and compute out of it the amount he expends for all the clothing he wears, and you will find it is not on an average more than 18 per cent. of the wages he earns; then take from this the part or portion he pays for his woolen clothes, and assume for the sake of argument, that the duty on these woolen clothes would be increased in price to the extent of the duty imposed, and you will see the insignificance of what he would have to pay. It would amount to almost nothing alongside of the increased wages that protection gives him; for he earns here double the amount he would earn in Europe for the same services.

But the duty on woolen goods, as on all other manufactured commodities in our country, does not increase and never has increased the price to the extent of the duty imposed. Domestic competition, our machinery, and the skill of our people have always come in and put down the price. Certain descriptions of woolen goods are now selling here in the United States very nearly as cheap, and in some instances quite as cheap, as they are selling in England. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, we exported from this

country nearly \$500,000 worth of woolen clothing. Of this amount \$71,000 worth went to England and Scotland. It does not look as if woolen clothing was very much cheaper in England than it is in this country when we are exporting it to England.

Some late and very important testimony is at hand confirming substantially much that I have said on this subject. It is from Mr. Schoenhof, a free-trader, appointed United States Consul at Tunstall, in England, by the present Administration. In his report recently made to the State Department, in speaking of prices in England, he says :

So far as clothing and dry goods in general are concerned I find that cotton goods are fully as cheap in the United States as here. Shirtings and sheetings, if anything, are superior in quality for the same money with us, so far as I can judge from the articles exposed for sale in the retail stores. Articles of underwear for women, made of muslin, are far superior in workmanship and finish and cheaper in price in the United States. . . . Nor can I find that men's shirts, when chiefly of cotton, are any cheaper here. Of boots and shoes, if factory made, the same may be said.

Articles made to order, he says, are cheaper in England owing to the low prices paid for hand labor. But he then says :

The difference in the price of ready-made things is not so marked. . . . In workmanship and finish I find corresponding articles of the wholesale process of manufacture superior in the United States. This is true of clothing as well as of collars, cuffs, and like articles.

The argument, then, which we so often hear that the laboring man and the farmer are being injured, over-taxed, and robbed because they pay more for their woolen coats and clothing than they would have to pay if they could buy them in England and bring them here free of duty is untrue and is made by the free-traders to deceive and mislead our people. Protection does the farmer no injury; he is benefited and not injured by it; and it would be a sad day for our farmers as well as for the laboring men of our country when our Protective system would be broken down, our industries transferred to England, and our home market destroyed.

LIMITED CAPACITY OF FOREIGN MARKETS.

As so much is said about the foreign market by some of our people, and as it is so often held up to our farmers as the market that is ready to take all our surplus products, it will be well to examine into it and see what its capacity is, and how far our farmers can rely upon it.

If we are to depend upon the foreign market to take all our surplus agricultural products it is certainly our duty to examine this foreign market so as to ascertain whether it is large enough to take this surplus. It will be remembered that the agricultural products of this country outside of cotton

and tobacco amount to about \$3,000,000,000, and that 92 per cent. of this is now consumed at home and only about 8 per cent. is exported. I know of but one country in Europe that is unable, in one form or another, to raise food enough to feed its own people, or, at least, to keep them from starving, and that country is England. The other countries buy articles of food to some extent, but they could, if they desired to do so, raise sufficient to feed their people. But England, with her dense population, cannot do it. She is compelled to buy food. Now, to what extent do the European countries purchase food? We will take wheat as the great agricultural staple. The whole crop of the world is computed to be 2,100,000,000 bushels. Of this quantity about 1,100,000,000 bushels are grown in Europe, about 450,000,000 bushels in the United States, about 287,000,000 bushels in India, and the remainder in other parts of the world. Eastern Europe has a surplus and Western Europe alone has a deficiency.

We raise a surplus of wheat, India raises a surplus, and Eastern Europe raises a surplus. It is only in Western Europe that we find a deficiency. The whole deficiency one year with another is about 200,000,000 bushels, and the United States, India and Eastern Europe are each competitors for supplying this deficiency, to say nothing of Australia and Canada. And in about the same proportion is the deficiency in the foreign market for the other articles of substantial food. Now, this is the size of the foreign market, and our farmers have to look to this foreign market for the sale of their surplus products after they break down the home market, and they might just as well look at it and contemplate it now as at any other time. The outlook for the farmers is not very encouraging as it is, and when they take into consideration the great and increasing competition of India it will be still less satisfactory, and this will not be improved when the home market is broken down, and many of the persons now employed in the manufactories of the country are turned out and driven to agriculture to earn their bread, becoming producers rather than consumers of agricultural products, and to this extent increasing the surplus. The foreign market would not be large enough then to take our surplus, even if India and Eastern Europe were entirely excluded; we ourselves would have much more than Europe would want or could take from us.

WHY PROTECTION IS REQUIRED FOR ALL AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

But some one may ask this question: If we can compete with England in the manufacture of the commodities the farmers consume, why do we require protection?

My first answer is, we want protection on all American products so that we can manufacture these commodities 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 that they can earn 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. As has been stated, 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 we go to England to buy these goods, as the free-traders want us to do, they would be made there, and these wages would be paid to the English workpeople, and not to our people. It is a question whether they shall be paid here to our own people or whether they shall be paid to the workpeople over there. And this is a most important question, and one upon which largely depends the future prosperity and welfare of our people and country.

My second answer is, we require protection on all American products to prevent our country from being made the dumping-ground for the overproduction of Europe. This overproduction is of frequent occurrence, and when it takes place, the English manufacturers realize on as much as they can dispose of at home, and throw the surplus upon us at any price they can obtain, with the view of breaking down the markets here, and bringing ruin upon our manufacturers and business men in the hope that they may profit by it in the future.

There is another question which may be asked. It is this: If our home market should be broken down by the repeal of the tariff would not the English be more likely to purchase our surplus products from us than they are now? My answer is, No. We have already seen the extent of the foreign market and how inadequate it is, even if we had it all to ourselves, but then as now it would be open to the competition of other nations, and the English would take just what they require and no more. And they would not even then take it from us unless they could buy it for less than they could elsewhere. If any other nation would sell it cheaper they would take it from them and not from us. It is a question with them, as with us, of dollars and cents, of quality and price. They want only what they require, and that at the lowest price. They would buy it then as now wherever they could get it cheapest.

The farmers of our country must be properly protected in the products they produce and properly protected in the home market in which they sell their surplus products to make agriculture profitable. If this is not done the agricultural industry will languish and become unremunerative. This is all the more necessary when they are brought, as they now are in the matter of wheat, directly in competition with the cheap labor of India. Wheat is now selling in London, and has been during the past year, for 30 cents less per

bushel than it would have brought had it not been for this India competition. Official statistics published by our Government show the extent of this competition. In the calendar year 1886 the United States exported 89,204,887 bushels of wheat, and in the year ended March 31, 1887, India exported 41,558,250 bushels, or almost half as much as the United States.

The price in London, where we sell our surplus, unfortunately for us, generally regulates the price here, and the loss to our farmers this year on their wheat crop of about 450,000,000 bushels has amounted to not less than \$135,000,000, and these low prices in wheat will continue, and there will be a loss to our farmers every year unless a remedy is found, or a war, famine, or a failure of crops should come in to keep up the price.

THE REMEDY.

The remedy is an easy one and in our own hands. All we have to do is to apply it. We now import only about 8 per cent. of the manufactured commodities we consume or use in this country. Let Congress pass such laws as will induce our people to manufacture here at home this 8 per cent. of manufactured commodities which we now import from Europe, and the effect will be to draw from agriculture a portion of the labor now engaged in it and thereby to this extent to lessen the quantity of agricultural products, and at the same time to increase the home market sufficiently to consume all our surplus products. We should then be no longer dependent upon Europe for the sale of our surplus agricultural products, as we now are, and London would not then, as she does now, fix the price at which our farmers shall sell their wheat. The price would be determined here at home and regulated, as it is with all other commodities, by the supply and demand, without regard to the competition of India or any other country.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
 University of California Library
 or to the
 NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
 Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
 University of California
 Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

JAN 22 2001

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C055620256

